COLLECTION OF PURITAN AND
ENGLISH THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE

LIBRARY OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

SCC
9168

John Patrick

Mr. *Chillingworth's* Book

CALLED THE

Religion of Protestants

A SAFE WAY TO

SALVATION,

Made more generally useful by omitting Personal Contests, but inserting whatsoever concerns the common Cause of *Protestants*, or defends the Church of *England*,

WITH

An ADDITION of some genuine Pieces of Mr. *Chillingworth's* never before Printed.

Isaac. Casaub. in Ep. ad Card. *Perron.* Reg. *Jac.* nomine scripta.

Rex arbitratur rerum absolutè necessariarum ad salutem non magnum esse numerum. Quare existimat ejus Majestas, nullam ad ineundem concordiam breviorem viam fore, quàm si diligentèr separentur necessaria à non necessariis, & ut de necessariis conveniat, omnis opera insumatur: in non necessariis libertati Christianæ locus detur, Simpliciter necessaria Rex appellat, quæ vel expresse verbum Dei præcipit credenda faciendave, vel ex verbo Dei necessariâ consequentiâ vetus Ecclesia elicuit. — Si ad decidendas hodiernas Controversias hæc distinctio adhiberetur, & jus divinum à positivo seu Ecclesiastico candidè separaretur; non videtur de iis quæ sunt absolutè necessaria, inter pios & moderatos viros, longa aut acris contentio futura. Nam & pauca illa sunt, ut modò dicebamus, & fere ex æquo omnibus probantur, qui se Christianos dici postulant. Atque istam distinctionem Sereniss. Rex tanti putat esse momenti ad minuendas Controversias, quæ hodie Ecclesiam Dei tantopere exercent, ut omnium pacis studiosorum judicet officium esse, diligentissimè hanc explicare, docere, urgere.

London, Printed for *R. Chiswell*, at the Rose and Crown in S. *Pauls* Church-yard, *C. Harper*, at the Flower de-Luce in *Fleetstreet*, *W. Crook*, at the Green-Dragon without *Temple-Bar*, and *J. Adamson* at the Angel in S. *Paul's* Church-yard. 1687.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013

http://archive.org/details/mrchis00patr

I Hope I ſhall incur no blame from thoſe who deſervedly value this Excellent BOOK *of Mr.* Chillingworth, *for having made it of a leſſer bulk and an eaſier purchaſe than before, after I have told them my way of proceeding herein: I have not Epitomized it in the uſual way, by contracting any where his ſenſe, and giving it more briefly in words of my own; which would have been indeed an injury to him, who knew ſo well how to expreſs his own ſenſe fully and perſpicuouſly beyond moſt men, without any redundancy of ſtyle; but by paring off and leaving out ſome parts of it, which I thought might be well ſpared, and make the Reading of his Book more pleaſant, as well as more generally uſeful, when his defence of the Proteſtant Doctrins and the cauſe of the Reformation lay more cloſely together not being interrupted with ſo many pages ſpent to juſtifie Dr.* Potter *in the perſonal conteſts betwixt him and his adverſary; or in detecting the ſophiſtry, frauds and falſities of the Jeſuit, where the matter was not of common concern. But where I thought it was, I have been ſcrupulouſly careful to omit nothing: ſo far from it, that I am apt upon a review to think, that the pleaſure of reading his admirable Confutation, has bribed me to inſert more than was needful, in purſuance of my firſt deſign.*

The reaſon why the Jeſuits Book which Mr. Chillingworth *anſwers is not here reprinted, was partly becauſe it is too tedious and wordy, abounding in impertinent cavils, and affecting to fetch a great compaſs to amuſe and loſe the*

Reader before he comes to the point in Question, which he scarce ever attempts closely to prove; and chiefly because Mr. Chillingworth *has commonly all along set down in a different Character, as much of his words, as was needful to let the Reader see, what it is he makes a Reply to, and where I found any omission of this kind, I have transcribed out of the Jesuits Book such passages and citations, as might give further light to it: besides, that every one who has a mind, or any doubt remaining about this matter, may easily consult the Folio Edition & satisfie himself.*

I have added a large Table of Contents *at the end which was wanting before, whereby the Reader may find any Argument or head of Discourse therein contained, with little or no trouble; which Table will serve any Edition of the Book, because the numbers after the Chapter refer to the divisions of the Chapters at the side, not to the Pages at the top.*

As for the Additional pieces that follow the Book, and were never before printed, he that reads them will find by the clearness of expression, the close way of arguing and strength of reasoning, sufficient to convince him that they are not spurious, but the genuine productions of this great Man; but yet for his further satisfaction he may know, that the Manuscript out of which most of them were faithfully transcribed, is an Original of Mr. Chillingworths *own handwriting, and now in the custody of the Reverend Dr.* Tennison, *to whom he is beholden for their present Publication.*

Farewel.

TO

TO THE

Moſt High and Mighty PRINCE,

CHARLES

BY THE GRACE OF GOD,

KING of Great *Brittain*, *France* and *Ireland*,
Defender of the Faith, &c.

May it pleaſe Your moſt Excellent Majeſty,

I Preſent, with all humility to Your moſt ſacred Hands, a Defence of that Cauſe which is and ought to be infinitely dearer to you, than all the world: Not doubting but upon this Dedication I ſhall be cenſured for a double boldneſs; both for undertaking ſo great a Work, ſo far beyond my weak abilities, and again, for preſenting it to ſuch a Patron, whoſe judgment I ought to fear more than any Adverſary. But for the firſt, it is a ſatisfaction to my ſelf, and may be to others, that I was not drawn to it out of any vain opinion of my ſelf, (whoſe perſonal defects are the only thing which I preſume to know,) but undertook it in obedience to Him, who ſaid, *Tu Converſus confirma fratres*, not to *S. Peter* only but to all men: being encouraged alſo to it by the goodneſs of the Cauſe, which is able to make a weak man ſtrong. To the belief hereof I was not led partially or by chance, as many are, by the prejudice and prepoſſeſſion of their Country, Education and ſuch like inducements, which if they lead to truth in one place, perhaps lead to error in a hundred; but having with the greateſt equality and indifferency, made enquiry and ſearch into the grounds on both ſides, I was willing to impart to

others

others that ſatisfaction which was given to my ſelf. For my inſcribing to it your Majeſties ſacred Name, I ſhould labour much in my excuſe of it from high preſumption, had it not ſome appearance of Title to your Majeſties Patronage and protection as being a Defence of that Book, which by ſpecial Order from Your Majeſty was written ſome years ſince chiefly for the general good, but peradventure not without ſome aim at the recovery of One of your meaneſt Subjects from a dangerous deviation, and ſo due unto your Majeſty, as the fruit of your own High humility and moſt Royal Charity. Beſides, it is in a manner nothing elſe, but a purſuance of, and a ſuperſtruction upon that bleſſed Doctrin, wherewith I have adorn'd and arm'd the Frontiſpiece of my Book, which was ſo earneſtly recommended by your Royal Father of happy memory, to all the lovers of Truth and Peace, that is to all that were like himſelf, as the only hopeful means of healing the breaches of Chriſtendom, whereof the Enemy of ſouls makes ſuch peſtilent advantage. The luſtre of this bleſſed Doctrin I have here endeavoured to uncloud and unveil, and to free it from thoſe miſts and fumes which have been rais'd to obſcure it, by that Order, which envenoms even poiſon it ſelf, and makes the *Roman* Religion much more malignant and turbulent than otherwiſe it would be; whoſe very Rule and Doctrin, obliges them to make all men, as much as lies in them, ſubjects unto Kings, and ſervants unto Chriſt, no farther than it ſhall pleaſe the Pope. So that whether Your Majeſty be conſidered, either as a pious Son towards your Royal Father K. *James*, or as a tender hearted and compaſſionate Son towards your diſtreſſed Mother, the Catholick Church, or as a King of your Subjects, or as a Servant unto Chriſt, this work, (to which I can give no other commendation, but that it was intended to do you ſervice in all theſe capacities,) may pretend not unreaſonably to your Gracious acceptance.

ceptance. Laſtly being a Defence of that whole Church and Religion you profeſs, it could not be ſo proper to any Patron as to the great Defender of it; which ſtile Your Majeſty hath ever ſo exactly made good, both in ſecuring it from all dangers, and in vindicating it (by the well ordering and rectifying this Church) from all the foul aſperſions both of Domeſtick and Forrein enemies, of which they can have no ground, but their own malice and want of Charity. But it's an argument of a deſpairing and loſt cauſe to ſupport it ſelf with theſe impetuous outcries and clamors, the faint refuges of thoſe that want better arguments; like that Stoick in *Lucian* that cried Ω̃ κατάρατε, *O damn'd villain*, when he could ſay nothing elſe. Neither is it credible the wiſer ſort of them ſhould believe this their own horrid aſſertion, That a God of goodneſs ſhould damn to eternal torments, thoſe that love him and love truth, for errors which they fall into through humane frailty! But this they muſt ſay, otherwiſe their only great argument from their damning us, and our not being ſo peremptory in damning them, becauſe we hope unaffected Ignorance may excuſe them, would be loſt: and therefore they are engaged to act on this Tragical part, only to fright the ſimple and ignorant, as we do little children by telling them that bites, which we would not have them meddle with. And truly that herein they do but act a part, and know themſelves to do ſo, and deal with us here as they do with the King of *Spain* at *Rome*, whom they accurſe and Excommunicate for faſhion ſake on *Maundy-Thurſday*, for detaining part of S. *Peters* Patrimony, and abſolve him without ſatisfaction on *Good-Friday*, methinks their faltring and inconſtancy herein, makes it very apparent. For though for the moſt part, they ſpeak nothing but thunder and lightning to us, and damn us all without mercy or exception, yet ſometimes to ſerve other purpoſes, they can be content to ſpeak to us in a milder ſtrain,

ſtrain, and tell us, as my adverſary does, more than once, *That they allow Proteſtants as much Charity as Proteſtants allow them.* Neither is this the only contradiction which I have diſcovered in this uncharitable Work; but have ſhewed that by forgetting himſelf, and retracting moſt of the principal grounds he builds upon, he hath ſaved me the labour of a confutation; which yet I have not in any place found any ſuch labour or difficulty, but that it was undertakeable by a man of very mean, that is, of my abilities. And the reaſon is, becauſe it is Truth I plead for; which is ſo ſtrong an argument for it ſelf, that it needs only light to diſcover it: whereas it concerns Falſhood and Error to uſe diſguiſes and ſhadowings and all the fetches of Art and Sophiſtry, and therefore it ſtands in need of abler men, to give that a colour at leaſt, which hath no real body to ſubſiſt by. If my endeavors in this kind may contribute any thing to this diſcovery, and the making plain that Truth (which my Charity perſwades me the moſt part of them diſaffect only, becauſe it has not been well repreſented to them,) I have the fruit of my labour, and my wiſh; who deſire to live to no other end, than to do ſervice to Gods Church and Your moſt Sacred Majeſty, in the quality of

Your Majeſties moſt faithful Subject,

and moſt humble and devoted Servant

WILLIAM CHILLINGWORTH.

THE

THE PREFACE TO THE AUTHOR OF Charity Maintained.

With an Answer to his Direction to *N. N.*

SIR,

UPON the first news of the publication of your Book, I used all diligence with speed to procure it; and came with such a mind to the reading of it, as *S. Austin* before he was a setled Catholick, brought to his conference with *Faustus* the Manichee. For as he thought, that if any thing more then ordinary might be said in defence of the Manichean Doctrine, *Faustus* was the man from whom it was to be expected: So my persuasion concerning you was,

Si Pergama dextrâ defendi possunt, certè hac defensa videbo.

If *Troy* by any Power could stand,
'Twould be defended by your hand.

1. For I conceived that among the Champions of the Roman Church, the *English* in Reason must be the best, or equal to the best, as being by most expert Masters trained up purposely for this war, and perpetually practised in it. Among the *English*, I saw the Jesuits would yield the first place to none; and Men so wise in their generation as the Jesuits were, if they had any *Achilles* among them, I presumed, would make choice of him for this service. And besides, I had good assurance that in the framing of this building, though you were the only Architect, yet you

wanted not the assistance of many diligent hands to bring you in choice materials towards it; nor of many careful and watchful eyes to correct the errors of your work, if any should chance to escape you. Great reason therefore had I to expect great matters from you, and that your Book should have in it the Spirit and Elixir of all that can be said in defence of your Church and Doctrin; and to assure my self, that if my resolution not to believe it, were not built upon the rock of evident grounds and reasons, but only upon some sandy and deceitful appearances, now the Wind and Storm and Floods were coming, which would undoubtedly overthrow it.

2. Neither truly were you more willing to effect such an alteration in me than I was to have it effected. For my desire is to go the right way to *Eternal Happiness*. But whether this way lie on the right-hand or the left, or strait forwards; whether it be by following a living Guide, or by seeking my directions in a Book, or by hearkening to the secret whisper of some private Spirit, to me it is indifferent. And he that is otherwise affected, and has not a Travellers indifference, which *Epictetus* requires in all that would find the truth, but much desires in respect of his ease, or pleasure, or profit, or advancement, or satisfaction of friends, or any human consideration, that one way should be true rather than another; it is odds but he will take his desire that it should be so, for an assurance that it is so. But I for my part, unless I deceive my self, was and still am so affected as I have made profession: not willing I confess to take any thing upon trust, and to believe it without asking my self why; no, nor able to command my self (were I never so willing) to follow, like a sheep, every shepheard that should take upon him to guide me; or every Flock that should chance to go before me: but most apt and most willing to be led by reason to any way, or from it; and always submitting all other Reasons to this one, God hath said so, therefore it is true. Nor yet was I so unreasonable as to expect Mathematical demonstrations from you in matters plainly incapable of them, such as are to be *believed*, and if we speak properly, cannot be

be *known* ; such therefore I expected not. For as he is an unreasonable Master, who requires a stronger assent to his conclusions than his arguments deserve ; so I conceive him a froward and undisciplin'd Scholar, who desires stronger arguments for a conclusion than the matter will bear. But had you represented to my understanding such reasons of your Doctrine, as being weighed in an even ballance, held by an even hand, with those on the other side, would have turned the Scale, and have made your Religion more credible than the contrary ; certainly I should have despised the shame of one more alteration, and with both mine armes and all my heart most readily have embraced it. Such was my expectation from you, and such my preparation, which I brought with me to the reading of your Book.

3. Would you know now what the event was, what effect was wrought in me by the perusal and consideration of it ? To deal truly and ingenuously with you, I fell somwhat in my good opinion both of your sufficiency and sincerity : but was exceedingly confirmed in the ill opinion of the Cause maintained by you. I found every where Snares that might entrap, and Colours that might deceive the Simple ; but nothing that might perswade, and very little that might move an understanding Man, and one that can discern between Discourse and Sophistry. In short, I was verily perswaded that I plainly saw and could make it appear, to all dis-passionate and unprejudicate Judges, that a vein of Sophistry and Calumny did run clean through it from the beginning to the end. And this I undertook with a full resolution to be an adversary to your Errors, but a Friend and Servant to your Person : and so much the more a Friend to your Person, by how much the severer and more rigid Adversary I was to your Errors.

4. In this work, my Conscience bears me witness, that I have according to your advice *proceeded always with this consideration, that I am to give a most strict account of every line, and word that passeth under my Pen* ; and therefore have been precisely careful for *the matter* of my Book to defend

truth only, and only by Truth. And then ſcrupulouſly fearful of Scandalizing you or any Man with the *manner* of handling it.

6. In your Pamphlet of Directions to *N. N.* you have loaded not only my perſon in particular, but all the Learned and Moderate Divines of the Church of *England*, and all Proteſtants in general, nay all wiſe Men of all Religions but your own, with unworthy Contumelies, and a Maſs of portentous and execrable Calumnies.

7. To begin with the laſt, you ſtick not in the beginning of your firſt Chapter, to faſten the imputation *of Atheiſm and Irreligion upon all wiſe and gallant Men, that are not of your own Religion.* In which uncharitable and unchriſtian Judgment, void of all colour or ſhadow of probability, I know yet by experience that very many of the *Bigots* of your Faction are partakers with you. God forbid I ſhould think the like of you! Yet if I ſhould ſay, that in your Religion there want not ſome temptations unto, and ſome Principles of Irreligion and Atheiſm, I am ſure I could make my Aſſertion much more probable than you have done, or can make this horrible imputation.

8. For to paſs by *firſt*, that which experience juſtifies, that where and when your Religion hath moſt abſolutely commanded, there and then Atheiſm hath moſt abounded; To ſay nothing *Secondly*, of your notorious and confeſſed forging of ſo many falſe Miracles, and ſo many lying Legends, which is not unlikely to make ſuſpitious men to queſtion the truth of all: Nor to object to you *Thirdly*, the abundance of your weak and ſilly Ceremonies and ridiculous Obſervances in your Religion, which in all probability cannot but beget ſecret contempt and ſcorn of it in wiſe and conſidering men, and conſequently Atheiſm and Impiety, if they have this perſuaſion ſetled in them (which is too rife among you, and which you account a piece of *Wiſdom and Gallantry*) that if they be not of your Religion, they were as good be of none at all: Nor to trouble you *Fourthly* with this, that a great part of your Doctrine, eſpecially in the Points conteſted,

tested, makes apparently for the temporal ends of the teachers of it; which yet I fear is a great scandal to many *Beaux Esprits* among you: Only I should desire you to consider attentively when you conclude so often from the differences of Protestants, that they have no certainty of any part of their Religion, no not of those Points wherein they agree, whether you do not that which so magisterially you direct me not to do, that is, proceed *a destructive way, and object arguments against your adversaries, which tend to the overthrow of all Religion?* And whether as you argue thus, *Protestants differ in many things, therefore they have no certainty of any thing:* So an Atheist or a Sceptick may not conclude as well, Christians, and the Professors of all Religions differ in many things, therefore they have no certainty of any thing? Again, I should desire you to tell me ingenuously, whether it be not too probable that your portentous Doctrine of Transubstantiation, joyn'd with your foremention'd persuasion of, *No Papists no Christians*, hath brought a great many others as well as himself, to *Averroes*'s resolution, *Quandoquidem Christiani adorant quod comedunt, sit anima mea cum Philosophis? Forasmuch as the Christians worship that which they eat, let my Soul be with the Philosophers.* Whether your requiring men upon only probable and *Prudential motives*, to yield a *most certain assent* unto things in humane reason impossible, and telling them, as you do too often, that they were as good not believe at all, as believe with any lower degree of Faith, be not a likely way to make considering men scorn your Religion, (and consequently all, if they know no other) as requiring things contradictory, and impossible to be performed? Lastly, Whether your pretence that there is no good ground to believe Scripture, but your Churches infallibility, joyn'd with your pretending no ground for this but some Texts of Scripture, be not a fair way to make them that understand themselves, believe neither Church nor Scripture?

9. Your Calumnies against Protestants in general are set down in these words, Chap. 2. §. 2. *The very doctrine*

of

of Protestants, if it be followed closely, and with coherence to it self, must of necessity induce Socinianism. *This I say confidently, and evidently prove, by instancing in one Error, which may well be termed the Capital and Mother-heresie, from which all other must follow at ease; I mean, their Heresie in affirming that the perpetual visible Church of Christ, descended by a never interrupted Succession from our Saviour to this day, is not infallible in all that it proposeth to be believed as revealed truths.*

For if the Infallibility *of such a publick* Authority *be once impeached; what remains, but that every man is given over to his own* wit *and* discourse? *and talk not here of holy Scripture, for if the true Church may err, in defining what Scriptures be Canonical; or in delivering the sense and meaning thereof, we are still devolved, either upon the* private Spirit *(a foolery now exploded out of* England, *which finally leaving every man to his own conceits, ends in* Socinianism) *or else upon* natural wit *and* judgment, *for examining and determining what Scriptures contain true or false Doctrine, and in that respect ought to be received or rejected. And indeed, take away the authority of Gods Church, no man can be assured, that any one Book or parcel of Scripture was written by Divine Inspiration; or that all the Contents are infallibly true, which are the direct Errors of* Socinians. *If it were but for this reason alone, no man, who regards the eternal salvation of his Soul, would live or die in* Protestancy, *from which, so vast absurdities as these of the* Socinians *must inevitably follow. And it ought to be an unspeakable comfort to all us Catholicks, while we consider, that none can deny the infallible authority of our Church, but jointly he must be left to his own wit and ways, and must abandon all* infused Faith *and true Religion, if he do but understand himself aright.* In all which Discourse, the only true word you speak, is, *This I say confidently:* As for *proving evidently*, that I believe you reserved for some other opportunity: for the present I am sure you have been very sparing of it.

10. You say indeed confidently enough, that *the denyal of the Churches infallibility is the Mother-heresie, from which all other must follow at ease*; which is so far from being

being a necessary truth, as you make it, that it is indeed a manifest falshood. Neither is it possible for the wit of man by any good, or so much as probable consequence, from the denial of the Churches Infallibility to deduce any one of the ancient Heresies, or any one Error of the *Socinians*, which are the Heresies here entreated of: For who would not laugh at him that should argue thus, Neither the Church of *Rome*, nor any other Church is infallible, *Ergo*, The Doctrine of *Arrius*, *Pelagius*, *Eutyches*, *Nestorius*, *Photinus*, *Manichæus*, was true Doctrine? On the other side, it may be truly said, and justified by very good and effectual reason, that he that affirms with you the Popes Infallibility, puts himself into his hands and power to be led by him at his ease and pleasure into all Heresie, and even to Hell it self, and cannot with reason say, (so long as he is constant to his grounds) *Domine cur ita facis?* Sir, *Why do you thus?* but must believe *white to be black, and black to be white*; *vertue to be vice, and vice to be vertue*; nay (which is a horrible, but a most certain truth) Christ to be Antichrist, and Antichrist to be Christ, if it be possible for the Pope to say so: Which I say and will maintain, howsoever you daub and disguise it, is indeed to make men apostate from Christ to his pretended Vicar, but real Enemy: For that name, and no better, (if we may speak truth without offence) I presume he deserves, who under pretence of interpreting the Law of Christ, (which Authority, without any word of express warrant, he hath taken upon himself) doth in many parts evacuate and dissolve it: So dethroning Christ from his dominion over mens consciences, and instead of Christ setting up himself. In as much as he that requires that his Interpretations of any Law should be obeyed as true and genuine, seem they to mens understandings never so dissonant and discordant from it, (as the Bishop of *Rome* does) requires indeed that *his Interpretations* should be the *Laws*; and he that is firmly prepared in mind to believe and receive all such Interpretations without judging of them, and though to his private judgment they seem unreasonable, is indeed congruously disposed

poſed to hold Adultery a venial ſin, and Fornication no ſin, whenſoever the Pope and his adherents ſhall ſo declare. And whatſoever he may plead, yet either wittingly or ignorantly he makes the Law and the Law-maker both ſtales, and obeys only the Interpreter. As if I ſhould ſubmit to the Laws of the King of *England*, but ſhould indeed reſolve to obey them in that ſence which the King of *France* ſhould put upon them whatſoever it were; I preſume every underſtanding man would ſay that I did indeed obey the King of *France* and not the King of *England*. If I ſhould pretend to believe the Bible, but that I would underſtand it accordingly to the ſenſe which the chief Mufty ſhould put upon it, who would not ſay that I were a Chriſtian in pretence only, but indeed a Mahumetan?

11. Nor will it be to purpoſe for you to pretend that the precepts of Chriſt are ſo plain that it cannot be feared, that any Pope ſhould ever go about to diſſolve them and pretend to be a Chriſtian: For, not to ſay that you now pretend the contrary, (to wit), *that the Law of Chriſt is obſcure, even in things neceſſary to be believed and done*; and by ſaying ſo, have made a fair way for any foul interpretation of any part of it: certainly that which the Church of *Rome* hath already done in this kind, is an evident argument, (that if ſhe once had this Power unqueſtioned and made expedite and ready for uſe, by being contracted to the Pope) ſhe may do what ſhe pleaſeth with it. Who that had lived in the Primative Church, would not have thought it as utterly improbable, that ever they ſhould have brought in the Worſhip of Images and Picturing of God, as now it is that they ſhould legitimate Fornication? Why may we not think they may in time take away the whole Communion from the Laity, as well as they have taken away half of it? Why may we not think that any Text and any ſenſe may not be accorded, as well as the whole 14. *Ch.* of the *Ep.* of S. *Paul* to the *Corinth.* is reconciled to the Latine ſervice? How is it poſſible any thing ſhould be plainer forbidden, than the *Worſhip of Angels*, in the *Ep.* to the *Coloſſians*? than *the teaching for Doctrines*

ctrines Mens commands in the Gospel of *S. Mark?* And therefore seeing we see these things done which hardly any man would have believed, that had not seen them, why should we not fear that this unlimited Power may not be used hereafter with as little moderation? Seeing devices have been invented how Men may worship Images without Idolatry, and Kill Innocent Men under pretence of Heresie without Murther, who knows not that some tricks may not be hereafter devised, by which lying with other Mens Wives shall be no Adultery, taking away other Mens Goods no Theft? I conclude therefore, that if *Solomon* himself were here, and were to determine the difference, which is more likely to be Mother of all Heresie, the *denial* of the *Churches*, or the *affirming* of the *Popes Infallibility*, that he would certainly say, *this is the Mother, give her the Child.*

12. You say again confidently, that *if this Infallibility be once impeached, every Man is given over to his own Wit and Discourse*: which, if you mean, *Discourse*, not guiding it selfe by Scripture, but only by principles of Nature, or perhaps by prejudices and popular errors, and drawing consequences not by rule but chance, is by no means true; if you mean by Discourse, right reason, grounded on Divine revelation and common notions, written by God in the hearts of all Men, and deducing, according to the never failing rules of Logick, consequent deductions from them, if this be it, which you mean by *Discourse*, it is very meet and reasonable and necessary that Men, as in all their actions, so especially in that of greatest importance, the choice of their way to happiness, should be left unto it: and he that follows this in all his opinions and actions, and does not only seem to do so, follows alwaies God; whereas he that followeth a Company of Men, may oftimes follow a Company of Beasts. And in saying this, I say no more than S. *John* to all Christians in these words, *Dearly beloved, Believe not every spirit, but try the spirits, whether they be of God, or no*: and the rule he gives them to make this tryal by, is to consider whether they *confess Jesus to be the Christ*; that is, the Guide of their Faith, and

Lord of their actions; not whether they acknowledg the *Pope* to be his Vicar: I ſay no more than S. *Paul* in exhorting all Chriſtians, *to try all things and to hold faſt that which is good*; than S. *Peter* in commanding all Chriſtians, *to be ready to give a reaſon of the hope that is in them*: than *our Saviour* himſelf in forewarning all his followers, that *if they blindly followed blind Guides, both leaders and followers ſhould fall into the Ditch*; and again in ſaying even to the People, *Yea and why of your ſelves Judge ye not what is right?* And though by paſſion, or precipitation, or prejudice; by want of Reaſon, or not uſing that they have, Men may be and are oftentimes led into Error and miſchief; yet that they cannot be miſguided by diſcourſe truly ſo called, ſuch as I have deſcribed, you your ſelf have given them ſecurity. For what is diſcourſe, but drawing concluſions out of premiſes by good conſequence? Now the principles which we have ſetled, to wit, the *Scriptures*, are on all ſides agreed to be infallibly true. And you have told us in the fourth chap. of this Pamphlet, that *from truth no man can by good conſequence infer falſhood*; Therefore by diſcourſe no Man can poſſibly be led to Error: but if he Err in his concluſions, he muſt of neceſſity either Err in his principles, (which here cannot have place,) or commit ſome Error in his diſcourſe; that is indeed, not diſcourſe but ſeem to do ſo.

13. You ſay thirdly, with ſufficient confidence, that *if the true Church may Err in defining what Scriptures be Canonical, or in delivering the ſenſe thereof, then we muſt follow either the private Spirit, or elſe natural wit and Judgment, and by them examine what Scriptures contain true or falſe Doctrine, and in that reſpect ought to be received or rejected:* All which is apparently untrue, neither can any proof of it be pretended. For though the preſent Church may poſſibly Err in her judgment touching this matter, yet have we other Directions in it, beſides the private ſpirit, and the examination of the Contents, (which latter way may conclude the negative very ſtrongly, to wit, that ſuch or ſuch a Book cannot come from God, becauſe it contains irreconcilable contradictions, but the affirmative

it

it cannot conclude, because the Contents of a Book may be all true, and yet the Book not written by Divine inspiration:) other Direction therefore I say we have, besides either of these three, and that is, the Testimony of the Primitive Christians.

14. You say Fourthly, with convenient boldness, That *this infallible Authority of your Church being denied, no man can be assured, that any parcel of Scripture was written by Divine inspiration* : Which is an untruth, for which no proof is pretended, and besides, void of modesty and full of impiety. The first, because the experience of innumerable Christians is against it, who are sufficiently assured, that the Scripture is Divinely inspired, and yet deny the infallible Authority of your Church or any other. The second, because if I cannot have ground to be assured of the Divine Authority of Scripture, unless I first believe your Church infallible, then I can have no ground at all to believe it: because there is no ground, nor can any be pretended, why I should believe your Church *Infallible*, unless I first believe the Scripture Divine.

16. Had I a mind to recriminate now, and to charge Papists (as you do Protestants) that they lead Men to Socinianism, I could certainly make a much fairer shew of evidence than you have done. For I would not tell you, you deny the Infallibility of the Church of *England*, *Ergo*, you lead to Socinianism, which yet is altogether as good an Argument as this; Protestants deny the Infallibility of the *Roman* Church, *Ergo*, they induce Socinianism: Nor would I resume my former Argument, and urge you, that by holding the *Popes* Infallibility, you submit your self to that Capital and Mother Heresie, by advantage whereof, he may lead you at ease to believe *vertue vice*, and *vice vertue*, to believe Antichristianity Christianism, and Christianity Antichristian; he may lead you to Socinianism, to Turcism, nay, to the Divel himself if he have a mind to it: But I would shew you that divers ways the Doctors of your Church do the principal and proper work of the Socinians for them, undermining the Doctrine of the Trinity, by denying it to be suppor-

ted by those Pillars of the Faith, which alone are fit and able to support it, I mean Scripture, and the Consent of the Ancient Doctors.

17. For *Scripture*, your Men deny very plainly and frequently, that this Doctrine can be proved by it. See if you please, this plainly taught, and urged very carnestly by Cardinal *Hosius*, *De Author. Sac. Scrip. l.* 3. *p.* 53. By *Gordonius Huntlæus*, *Contr. Tom.* 1. *Controv.* 1. *De verbo Dei C.* 19. by *Gretserus* and *Tanerus*, *in Colloquio Ratesbon:* And also by *Vega*, *Possevin*, *Wiekus*, and *Others.*

18. And then for *the Consent of the Ancients*, that that also delivers it not, by whom are we taught but by Papists only? Who is it that makes known to all the World, that *Eusebius* that great searcher and devourer of the Christian Libraries *was an Arrian?* Is it not your great *Achilles*, *Cardinal Perron*, in his 3. Book 2. Chap. of his Reply to K. *James?* Who is it that informs us that *Origen* (who never was questioned for any Error in this matter, in or near his time) *denyed the Divinity of the Son and the Holy Ghost?* Is it not the same great Cardinal, in his Book *of the Eucharist* against *M. du Plessis. l.* 2. *c.* 7? Who is it that pretends that *Irenæus hath said those things, which he that should now hold, would be esteemed an Arrian?* Is it not the same *Perron* in his Reply to K. *James*, in the Fifth Chap. of his Fourth Observation? And does he not in the same place peach *Tertullian* also, and in a manner give him away to the *Arrians?* And pronounce generally of the *Fathers before the Council of Nice*, That *the* Arrians *would gladly be tryed by them?* And are not your fellow Jesuits also, even the Prime Men of your Order, prevaricators in this point as well as others? Doth not your Friend M. *Fisher*, or M. *Flued* in his Book of the Nine Questions proposed to him by K. *James* speak dangerously to the same purpose, in his Discourse *of the Resolution of Faith*, towards the end? Giving us to understand, *That the new Reformed* Arrians *bring very many Testimonies of the Ancient Fathers, to prove that in this Point they did contradict themselves, and were contrary one to another: which places whosoever shall read will clearly see, that to common*

common People they are unanswerable, yea, that common People are not capable of the Answers that Learned Men yield unto such obscure passages. And hath not your great Antiquary *Petavius*, in his Notes upon *Epiphanius in Hær.* 69. been very liberal to the Adversaries of the Doctrine of the Trinity, and in a manner given them for Patrons and Advocates, first *Justin Martyr*, and then almost all the Fathers before the Council of *Nice*, whose Speeches he says, touching this point, *cum Orthodoxæ fidei regula minime consentiunt*: *Are no way agreeable to the rule of Orthodox Faith.* Hereunto I might add, that the Dominicans and Jesuits between them in another matter of great importance, viz. *Gods Prescience of future contingents*, give the *Socinians* the premises, out of which their conclusion doth unavoidably follow. For the *Dominicans* maintain on the one Side, that *God can foresee nothing but what he Decrees:* The Jesuits on the other Side, that *he doth not Decree all things*: And from hence the *Socinians* conclude (as it is obvious for them to do) that *he doth not foresee all things.* Lastly, I might adjoyn this, that you agree with one consent, and settle for a rule unquestionable, that no part of Religion can be repugnant to Reason, whereunto you in particular subscribe unawares in saying, *From truth no Man can by good consequence infer falshood*, which is to say in effect, that Reason can never lead any Man to Error: And after you have done so, you proclaim to all the World (as you in this Pamphlet do very frequently,) that *if Men follow their Reason and Discourse*, they will (if they understand themselves) be led to *Socinianism.* And thus you see with what probable matter I might furnish out and justifie my accusation, if I should charge you with leading Men to *Socinianism*! Yet I do not conceive that I have ground enough for this odious imputation. And much less should you have charged *Protestants* with it, whom you confess to abhor and detest it: and who fight against it, not with the broken Reeds, and out of the Paper Fortresses of an imaginary Infallibility, which were only to make sport for their Adversaries; but with the *Sword of the Spirit, the Word of God:* of which we may say

ſay moſt truly, what *David* ſaid of *Goliah's* Sword, offered him by *Abilech*, *non eſt ſicut iſte, There is none comparable to it.*

19. Thus *Proteſtants* in general, I hope, are ſufficiently vindicated from your Calumny: I proceed now to do the ſame ſervice for the Divines of *England*; whom you queſtion firſt in point of Learning and Sufficiency, and then in point of Conſcience and Honeſty, as prevaricating in the Religion which they profeſs, and inclining to *Popery*. Their Learning (you ſay) conſiſts only in *ſome ſuperficial Talent of Preaching, Languages, and Elocution, and not in any deep knowledg of Philoſophy, eſpecially of Metaphyſicks, and much leſs of that moſt ſolid, profitable, ſubtile,* & (O rem ridiculam *Cato* & jocoſam!) *ſuccinct method of School Divinity.* Wherein you have diſcovered in your ſelf the true Genius and Spirit of detraction. For taking advantage from that wherein envy it ſelf cannot deny but they are very eminent, and which requires great ſufficiency of ſubſtantial Learning, you diſparage them as inſufficient in all things elſe. As if Forſooth, becauſe they diſpute not eternally. *Utrum Chimæra bombinans in vacuo, poſſit comedere ſecundas Intentiones? Whether a Million of Angels may not ſit upon a Needles point?* Becauſe they fill not their Brains with notions that ſignifie nothing, to the utter extermination of all reaſon and common ſence, and ſpend not an Age in weaving and un-weaving ſubtile Cobwebs, fitter to catch Flies than Souls; therefore they have no deep knowledge in the Acroamatical part of Learning! But I have too much honoured the poorneſs of this detraction to take notice of it.

20. The other Part of your accuſation ſtrikes deeper, and is more conſiderable: And that tells us that, *Proteſtantiſm waxeth weary of it ſelf; that the Profeſſors of it, they eſpecially of greateſt Worth, Learning, and Authority, love temper and moderation: and are at this time more unreſolved where to faſten, than at the Infancy of their Church:* That *their Churches begin to look with a New Face: Their Walls to Speak a New Language: Their Doctrine to be altered in many things, for which their Progenitors forſook the then Viſible*

Visible Church of Christ : *For example, the* Pope *not Antichrist* : *Prayer for the Dead* : *Limbus Patrum* : *Pictures* : *That the Church hath Authority in determining Controversies of Faith, and to interpret Scripture* ; *about Freewil, Predestination, Universal Grace* : That *all our Works are not Sins* : *Merit of good Works* : *Inherent Justice* : *Faith alone doth not justifie* : *Charity to be preferred before knowledg* : *Traditions* : *Commandments possible to be kept* : That *their thirty nine Articles are patient, nay ambitious of some sence wherein they may seem Catholick* : That to *Alledge the necessity of Wife and Children in these days, is but a weak Plea for a Married Minister to compass a Benefice* : That *Calviniſm is at length accounted Heresie, and little less than Treason* : That *Men in Talk and Writing use willingly the once fearful Names of Priests and Altars* : That *they are now put in mind, that for exposition of Scripture, they are by* Canon *bound to follow the Fathers* : *which if they do with sincerity, it is easie to tell what Doom will pass against* Protestants ; *seeing by the confession of* Protestants, *the Fathers are on the* Papists *side, which the Answerer to some so clearly demonstrated, that they remained convinced* : *In fine, as the* Samaritans *saw in the Disciples countenances, that they meant to go to* Hierusalem, *so you pretend it is even legible in the Fore-heads of these Men, that they are even going, nay making hast to* Rome. Which scurrilous Libel void of all Truth, Discretion and Honesty, what effect it may have wrought, what credit it may have gained with credulous *Papists*, (who dream what they desire, and believe their own dreams,) or with ill-affected, jealous, and weak *Protestants*, I cannot tell : But one thing I dare boldly say, that you your self did never believe it.

21. The truth is, they that run to extreams in opposition against you, they that pull down your Infallibility and set up their own, they that declaim against your Tyranny, and exercise it themselves over others, are the Adversaries that give you the greatest advantage, and such as you love to deal with : whereas upon Men of temper and moderation, such as will oppose nothing because you maintain it, but will draw as near to you, that they

may

may draw you to them, as the Truth will ſuffer them : ſuch as require of Chriſtians to believe only in Chriſt, and will Damn no Man nor Doctrine without expreſs and certain warrant from Gods Word : upon ſuch as theſe you know not how to faſten ; but if you chance to have conference with any ſuch, (which yet as much as poſſibly you can you avoid and decline,) you are very ſpeedily put to ſilence, and ſee the indefenſible weakneſs of your cauſe laid open to all Men. And this I verily believe is the true Reaſon that you thus rave and rage againſt them, as foreſeeing your time of prevailing, or even of ſubſiſting, would be ſhort, if other adverſaries gave you no more advantage than they do.

22. In which perſwaſion alſo I am much confirmed by conſideration of the Silline ſs and Poorneſs of thoſe ſuggeſtions, and partly of the apparent vanity and Falſhood of them, which you offer in juſtification of this wicked Calumny. For what if out of Devotion towards God ; out of a deſire that He ſhould be Worſhiped as *in Spirit and Truth* in the firſt place, ſo alſo *in the Beauty of Holineſs?* what if out of fear, that too much Simplicity and Nakedneſs in the publick Service of God may beget in the ordinary ſort of Men a dull and ſtupid irreverence, and out of hope that the outward State and Glory of it, being well diſpoſed and wiſely moderated, may ingender, quicken, encreaſe and nouriſh the inward reverence, reſpect and devotion which is due unto Gods Sovereign Majeſty and Power ? What if out of a perſuaſion and deſire that *Papiſts* may be won over to us the ſooner, by the removing of this Scandal out of their way ; and out of an Holy Jealouſie, that the weaker ſort of *Proteſtants* might be the eaſier ſeduced to them by the Magnificence and Pomp of their Church-ſervice in caſe it were not removed ? I ſay, what if out of theſe conſiderations, the Governors of our Church, more of late than formerly, have ſet themſelves to adorn and beautifie the places *where Gods Honour dwells,* and to make them as Heavenly as they can with Earthly Ornaments? Is this a ſign that they are warping towards *Popery ?* Is this Devotion

in

in the Church of *England*, an argument that She is coming over to the Church of *Rome*? Sir *Edwin Sands*, I presume every Man will grant, had no inclination that way; yet He Forty Years since highly commended this part of Devotion in *Papists*, and makes no scruple of proposing it to the imitation of *Protestants*: little thinking that they who would follow his Counsel, and endeavour to take away this disparagement of *Protestants*, and this Glorying of *Papists*, should have been censured for it, as making way and inclining to *Popery*. His Words to this purpose are excellent Words, and because they shew plainly, that what is now practised was approved by Zealous *Protestants* so long ago, I will here set them down. Survey of Religion.

23. *This one thing I cannot but highly commend in that sort and Order: They spare nothing which either cost can perform in enriching, or skill in adorning the Temple of God, or to set out his Service with the greatest Pomp and magnificence that can be devised. And although, for the most part, much Baseness and Childishness is predominant in the Masters and contrivers of their Ceremonies, yet this outward State and Glory being well disposed, doth ingender, quicken, increase, and nourish the inward reverence, respect and Devotion, which is due unto Sovereign Majesty and Power. And although I am not ignorant that many Men well reputed have embraced the thrifty Opinion of that Disciple, who thought all to be wasted that was bestowed upon Christ in that sort, and that it were much better bestowed upon him on the Poor, (yet with an eye perhaps that themselves would be his quarter Almoners,) notwithstanding I must confess, it will never sink into my Heart, that in proportion of Reason, the allowance for furnishing out of the Service of God should be measured by the scant and strict rule of meer necessity, (a proportion so low that Nature to other most bountiful in matter of necessity, hath not failed no not the most ignoble Creatures of the World,) and that for our selves no measure of heaping but the most we can get, no rule of expence but to the utmost Pomp we list: Or that God himself had so inriched the lower parts of the World with such wonderfull varieties of Beauty and Glory, thut they might serve only to the Pampering of Mortal Man in his Pride; and*

that in the Service of the High Creator Lord and giver, (the outward Glory of whose higher Pallace may appear by the very Lamps that we see so far off Burning gloriously in it) only the Simpler, Baser, Cheaper, Less Noble, Less Beautiful, Less Glorious things should be imployed. Especially seeing as in Princes Courts, so in the Service of God also, this outward State and Glory, being well disposed, doth (as I have said) ingender, quicken, increase and nourish the inward reverence, respect and Devotion, which is due to so Sovereign Majesty and Power. Which those whom the use thereof cannot perswade unto, would easily by the want of it be brought to confess; for which cause I crave leave to be excused by them herein, if in Zeal to the common Lord of all, I choose rather to commend the vertue of an Enemy than to flatter the vice and imbecility of a Friend. And so much for this matter.

24. Again, what if the Names of the *Priests* and *Altars* so frequent in the Ancient Fathers, though not in the now *Popish* sense, be now resumed and more commonly used in *England* than of late times they were: that so the colourable argument of their conformity, which is but nominal, with the Ancient Church, and our inconformity, which the Governors of the Church would not have so much as nominal, may be taken away from them; and the Church of *England* may be put in a State, in this regard more justifiable against the *Roman* than formerly it was, being hereby enabled to say to *Papists* (whensoever these Names are objected,) we also use the Names of *Priests* and *Altars*, and yet believe neither the Corporal Presence, nor any Proper and propitiatory Sacrifice?

25. What if *Protestants* be now put in mind, that for exposition of Scripture, they are bound by a *Canon to follow the Ancient Fathers*: which whosoever doth with sincerity, it is utterly impossible he should be a *Papist?* And it is most falsly said by you, that you know that to some *Protestants* I clearly demonstrated, or ever so much as undertook, or went about to demonstrate the contrary. What if the Centurists be censured somewhat roundly by a *Protestant* Divine for affirming, that *the keeping of the Lords day was a thing indifferent for two Hundren Years?* Is there in all

all this or any part of it any kind of proof of this scandalous Calumny?

26. As for the points of Doctrine wherein you pretend that these Divines begin of late to falter, and to comply with the Church of *Rome*, upon a due examination of particulars it will presently appear, *First*, that part of them always have been, and now are held constantly one way by them; as the Authority of the Church in determining Controversies of Faith, though not the Infallibility of it: That there is Inherent Justice, though so imperfect that it cannot justifie: That there are Traditions, though none necessary: That Charity is to be preferred before knowledg: That good Works are not properly meritorious: And lastly, that Faith alone justifies, though that Faith justifies not which is alone. And *Secondly*, for the remainder that they, every one of them, have been Anciently without breach of Charity disputed among *Protestants*, such for example were the Questions about the *Popes* being the Antichrist, the Lawfulness of some kind of Prayers for the Dead, the Estate of the Fathers Souls, before Christs Ascension; Freewil, Predestination, Universal Grace: the Possibility of keeping Gods Commandments. The use of Pictures in the Church: Wherein that there hath been anciently diversity of opinion anongst *Protestants*, it is justified to my hand by a witness, with you, beyond exception, even your great Friend M. *Brerely, whose care, exactness and fidelity* (you say in your Preface) *is so extraordinary great*. Consult him therefore: Tract. 3. Sect. 7. of his *Apology*: And in the 9, 10, 11. 14. 24. 26. 27. 37. Subdivisions of that *Section*, you shall see as in a mirror, your self proved an egregious calumniator, for charging *Protestants* with innovation and inclining to *Popery*, under pretence forsooth, that their Doctrine begins of late to be altered in these points. Whereas, M *Brerely* will inform you, they have been anciently, and even from the begininng of the Reformation, controverted amongst them, though perhaps the Stream and Current of their Doctors run one way, and only some Brook or Rivulet of them the other.

27. It remains now in the laſt place, that I bring my ſelf fairly off from your foul Aſperſions, that ſo my Perſon may not be any diſparagement to the Cauſe, nor any ſcandal to weak Chriſtians.

28. Firſt upon Hearſay, you charge me with a great number of falſe and impious Doctrines, which I will not name in particular, becauſe I will not aſſiſt you ſo far in the ſpreading of my own undeſerved defamation: but whoſoever teaches or holds them *let him be Anathema*! The Summ of them all is this, *Nothing ought or can be certainly believed, farther than it may be proved by evidence of Natural Reaſon:* (where I conceive Natural reaſon it oppoſed to ſupernatural Revelation) and whoſoever holds ſo *let him be Anathema*! And moreover to clear my ſelf once for all, from all imputations of this nature, which charge me injuriouſly with denial of Supernatural Verities, I profeſs ſincerely, that I believe all thoſe Books of Scripture, which the Church of *England* accounts Canonical, to be the Infallible Word of God: I believe all things evidently contained in them; all things evidently, or even probably deducible from them: I acknowledge all that to be Hereſie, which by the Act of Parliament *primo of Q.* Eliz. is declared to be ſo, and only to be ſo: And though in ſuch points which may be held diverſly of divers men *ſalvâ Fidei compage*, I would not take any Mans Liberty from him, and humbly beſeech all men, that they would not take mine from me! Yet thus much I can ſay (which I hope will ſatisfie any man of reaſon,) that whatſoever hath been held neceſſary to Salvation, either by the Catholick Church of all ages, or by the conſent of Fathers, meaſured by *Vincentius Lyrinenſis* his rule, or is held neceſſary either by the Catholick Church of this age, or by the conſent of *Proteſtants*, or even by the Church of *England*, that, againſt the *Socinians*, and all others whatſoever, I do verily believe and embrace.

29. But what are all Perſonal matters to the buſineſs in hand? If it could be proved that Cardinal *Bellarmine* was indeed a *Jew*, or that Cardinal *Perron* was an *Atheiſt*, yet I preſume you would not accept of this for an Anſwer

to

to all their writings in defence of your Religion. Let then my actions and intentions and opinions be what they will, yet I hope truth is nevertheless Truth, nor reason ever the less Reason because I speak it. And therefore the Christian Reader, knowing that his Salvation or Damnation depends upon his impartial and sincere judgment of these things, will guard himself I hope from these Impostures, and regard not the Person but the cause and the reasons of it; not who speaks but what is spoken: Which is all the favour I desire of him, as knowing that I am desirous not to persuade him, unless it be truth whereunto I persuade him.

30. The last Accusation is, That *I answer out of Principles which* Protestants *themselves will profess to detest*: which indeed were to the purpose if it could be justified. But, besides that it is confuted by my whole Book, and made ridiculous by the Approbations premised unto it, it is very easie for me out of your own Mouth and Words to prove it a most injurious calumny. For what one Conclusion is there in the whole Fabrick of my Discourse, that is not naturally deducible out of this one Principle, That *all things necessary to Salvation are evidently contained in Scripture?* Or what one Conclusion almost of importance is there in your Book, which is not by this one clearly confutable? Grant this, and it will presently follow in opposition to your first Conclusion, and the argument of your first Ch: that amongst men of different opinions, touching the obscure and controverted Questions of Religion, such as may with probability be disputed on both Sides (and such as are the disputes of *Protestants*;) Good men and lovers of truth of all Sides may be saved; because all necessary things being supposed evident, concerning them, with men so qualified, there will be no difference: There being no more certain sign that a Point is not evident, than that honest and understanding and indifferent men, and such as give themselves liberty of judgment, after a mature consideration of the matter differ about it.

31. Grant

31. Grant this, and it will appear, *Secondly*, that the means whereby the revealed Truths of God are conveyed to our understanding, and which are to determine all Controversies in Faith, necessary to be determined, may be, for any thing you have said to the contrary, not a Church but the Scripture; which contradicts the Doctrine of your *Second Chapter*.

32. Grant this, and the distinction of points Fundamental and not Fundamental, will appear very good and pertinent. For those truths will be Fundamental, which are evidently delivered in Scripture, and commanded to be Preached to all men; Those not Fundamental which are obscure. And nothing will hinder, but that the Catholick Church may Err in the latter kind of the said points: because Truths not necessary to the Salvation, cannot be necessary to the being of a Church; and because it is not absolutely necessary that God should assist his Church any farther than to bring Her to Salvation; neither will there be any necessity at all of any Infallible Guide, either to consign unwritten Traditions, or to declare the obscurities of the Faith. Not for the former end, because this Principle being granted true, nothing unwritten can be necessary to be consigned. Nor for the latter, because nothing that is obscure can be necessary to be understood, or not mistaken. And so the discourse of your whole *Third Chap:* will presently vanish.

33. *Fourthly*, for the Creed's containing the Fundamentals of simple belief, though I see not how it may be deduced from this principle, yet the granting of this plainly renders the whole dispute touching the Creed necessary. For if all necessary things of all sorts, whether of simple belief or practice be confessed to be clearly contained in Scripture, what imports it whether those of one sort be contained in the Creed?

34. *Fifthly*, let this be granted, and the immediate Corollary in opposition to your Fifth Chap. will be and must be, That, not Protestants for rejecting, but the Church of *Rome* for imposing upon the Faith of Christians, Doctrines unwritten and unnecessary, and for disturbing

sturbing the Churches Peace, and dividing Unity for such matters, is in a high degree presumptuous and Schismatical.

35. Grant this, *sixthly*, and it will follow unavoidably that *Protestants* cannot possibly be Heretieks, seeing they believe all things evidently contained in Scripture, which are supposed to be all that is necessary to be believed: and so your *Sixth Chapter* is clearly confuted.

36. Grant this Lastly, and it will be undoubtedly consequent, in contradiction of your *Seventh Chapter*, that no Man can shew more Charity to himself than by continuing a *Protestant*, seeing *Protestants* are supposed to believe, and therefore may accordingly practice, at least by their Religion are not hindered from practising and performing all things necessary to Salvation.

37. So that the position of this one Principle, is the direct overthrow of your whole Book, and therefore I needed not, nor indeed have I made use of any other. Now this principle, which is not only the Corner-stone or chief Pillar, but even the base, and adequate Foundation of my Answer; and which while it stands firm and unmovable, cannot but be the supporter of my Book, and the certain ruin of yours, is so far from being, according to your pretence, detested by all *Protestants*, that all *Protestants* whatsoever, as you may see in their Harmony of Confessions, unanimously profess and maintain it. And you your self, C. 6. § 30. plainly confess as much, in saying, *The whole Edifice of the Faith of* Protestants *is setled on these two Principles: These particular Books are Canonical Scripture*: *And the sense and meaning of them is plain and evident at least in all points necessary to Salvation.*

38. And thus your Venom against me is in a manner spent, saving only that there remain two little impertinences, whereby you would disable me from being a fit advocate for the cause of *Protestants*. The first, because I refuse to subscribe the Artic. of the Ch. of *England*: The second, because I have set down in writing, motives which sometime induced me to forsake Protestantism, and hitherto have not answered them.

39. By

39. By the former of which objections it ſhould ſeem, that either you conceive the 39 Articles the common Doctrine of all Proteſtants, and if they be, why have you ſo often upbraided them with their many and great differences? Or elſe that it is the peculiar defence of the Church of *England*, and not the common cauſe of all *Proteſtants*, which is here undertaken by me: which are certainly very groſs miſtakes. And yet, why he who makes ſcruple of ſubſcribing the truth of one or two Propoſitions, may not yet be fit enough to maintain, that thoſe who do ſubſcribe them, are in a ſaveable condition, I do not underſtand. Now though I hold not the Doctrine of all *Proteſtants* abſolutely true, (which with reaſon cannot be required of me while they hold contradictions,) yet I hold it free from all impiety, and from all Error deſtructive of Salvation, or in it ſelf damnable: And this I think in reaſon may ſufficiently qualifie me, for a maintainer of this aſſertion, that *Proteſtancy deſtroys not Salvation.* For the Church of *England*, I am perſuaded that the conſtant Doctrine of it is ſo pure and Orthodox, that whoſoever believes it and lives according to it, undoubtedly he ſhall be ſaved; and that there is no Error in it which may neceſſitate or warrant any Man to diſturb the peace or renounce the Communion of it. This in my opinion is all intended by Subſcription, and thus much if you conceive me not ready to ſubſcribe, your *Charity* I aſſure you is much *miſtaken.*

40. Your other Objection is yet more impertinent and frivolous than the former: Unleſs perhaps it be a juſt exception againſt a Phyſitian, that himſelf was ſometimes in, and recovered himſelf from that Diſeaſe which he undertakes to cure; or againſt a Guide in a way, that at firſt before he had experience, himſelf miſtook it, and afterwards found his error and amended it. That noble writer *Michael de Montai'gne*, was ſurely of a far different mind; for he will hardly allow any Phyſitian competent, but only for ſuch Diſeaſes as himſelf had paſſed through: And a far greater than *Montai'gne*, even he that ſaid, *Tu converſus confirma fratres, when thou art converted, ſtrengthen thy*

by Brethren, gives us sufficiently to understand, that they which have themselves been in such a state as to need Conversion, are not thereby made incapable of, but rather engaged and obliged unto, and qualified for this Charitable Function.

41. The Motives then, hitherto not answered, were these.

42. *I. Because perpetual visible profession, which could never be wanting to the Religion of Christ, nor any part of it, is apparently wanting to* Protestant *Religion, so far as concerns the points in contestation.*

II. Because Luther *and his followers, separating from the Church of* Rome, *separated also from all Churches, pure or impure, true or false then being in the world; upon which ground I conclude, that either Gods promises did fail of performance, if there were then no Church in the World, which held all things necessary, and nothing repugnant to Salvation; or else that* Luther *and his Sectaries, separating from all Churches then in the World, and so from the true, if there were any true, were* damnable Schismaticks.

III. Because, if any credit may be given to as credible records, as any are extant, the Doctrine of Catholicks hath been frequently confirmed; and the opposite Doctrine of Protestants, *confounded with supernatural and Divine Miracles.*

IV. Because many points of Protestant *Doctrine, are the damned Opinions of Hereticks, condemned by the Primitive Church.*

V. Because the Prophecies of the Old Testament, *touching the Conversion of Kings and Nations to the true Religion of Christ, have been accomplished in and by the Catholick* Roman *Religion, and the Professors of it; and not by* Protestant *Religion, and the Professors of it.*

VI. Because the Doctrine of the Church of Rome *is conformable, and the Doctrine of* Protestants *contrary, to the Doctrine of the Fathers of the Primitive Church, even by the Confession of* Protestants *themselves; I mean, those Fathers, who lived within the compass of the first* 600. *years; to whom* Protestants *themselves do very frequently, and very confidently appeal.*

VII. Because the first pretended Reformers had neither extraordinary Commission *from God, nor ordinary* Mission *from the Church, to Preach* Protestant Doctrine.

VIII. Becauſe Luther, *to Preach againſt the Maß (which contains the moſt material points now in controverſie) was perſuaded by reaſons ſuggeſted to him by the Devil himſelf, diſputing with him. So himſelf profeſſeth in his Book* de Miſſa Privata. *That all men might take heed of following him, who profeſſeth himſelf to follow the Devil.*

IX. Becauſe the Proteſtant *cauſe is now, and hath been from the beginning, maintained with groſſe falſifications, and Calumnies; whereof their prime Controverſie writers, are notoriouſly, and in high degree guilty.*

X. Becauſe by denying all humane Authority, either of Pope, *or Councils, or Church, to determine Controverſies of Faith, they have aboliſhed all poſſible means of ſuppreſſing Hereſie, or reſtoring Unity to the Church.*

Theſe are the Motives; now my Anſwers to them follow briefly and in order.

43. To the firſt: God hath neither drecreed nor foretold, that his true Doctrine ſhould *de facto* be alwaies viſibly profeſſed, without any mixture of falſhood.

To the ſecond: God hath neither decreed nor foretold, that there ſhall be alwaies a viſible Company of Men free from all Error in it ſelf Damnable. Neither is it alwaies of neceſſity Schiſmatical to ſeparate from the external Communion of a Church, though wanting nothing neceſſary: For if this Church ſuppoſed to want nothing neceſſary, require me to profeſs againſt my Conſcience, that I believe ſome Error, tho never ſo ſmall and innocent, which I do not believe, and will not allow me Her Communion, but upon this condition: In this caſe, the Church for requiring this condition is Schiſmatical, and not I for ſeparating from the Church.

To the third: If any credit may be given to Records far more creditable than theſe, the Doctrine of *Proteſtants*, that is, the Bible hath been confirmed, and the Doctrine of *Papiſts*, which is in many points plainly oppoſite to it, confounded with Supernatural and Divine Miracles, which for number and Glory, out-ſhine *Popiſh* pretended Miracles, as much as the Sun doth an *Ignis fatuus*, thoſe I mean which were wrought by our Saviour Chriſt and his Apoſtles,

stles : Now this Book, by the Confession of all sides confirmed by innumerous Miracles, foretels me plainly, that in after Ages, great Signs and Wonders shall be wrought in confirmation of false Doctrine, and that I am not to believe any Doctrine which seems to my understanding repugnant to the first, though an Angel from Heaven should teach it ; which were certainly as great a Miracle as any that was ever wrought in attestation of any part of the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* : But that true Doctrine should in all Ages have the testimony of Miracles, that I am no where taught ; So that I have more reason to suspect and be afraid of pretended Miracles, as signs of false Doctrine, then much to regard them as certain arguments of the truth. Besides, setting aside the Bible, and the Tradition of it, there is as good story for Miracles wrought by those who lived and died in opposition to the Doctrine of the *Roman* Church, (as by S. *Cyprian*, *Colmannus*, *Columbanus*, *Aidanus* and others,) as there is for those that are pretended to be wrought by the Members of that Church. Lastly, it seems to me no strange thing, that God in his Justice should permit some true Miracles to be wrought to delude them, who have forged so many, as apparently the Professors of the *Roman* Doctrine have to abuse the World.

To the Fourth : All those were not [a] Hereticks which by *Philastrius*, *Epiphanius*, or S. *Austine* were put in the Catalogue of Hereticks.

To the Fifth : Kings and Nations have been, and may be Converted by Men of contrary Religions.

To the Sixth : The Doctrine of *Papists*, is confessed by *Papists* contrary to the Fathers in many points.

To the Seventh : The Pastors of a Church cannot but have Authority from it, to Preach against the abuses of it, whether in Doctrine or Practice, if there be any in it : Neither can any Christian want an ordinary commission from God to do a necessary work of Charity after a peacable manner, when there is no body else that can or will do it. In extraordinary cases, extraordinary courses are not to be disallowed. If some Christian Lay-man

[a] See this acknowledged by Bellar : *de Scrip : Eccles. in Philastrio :* by *Petavius Animad. in Epiph. de inscrip. operis :* By S. Austin. *Lib. de Hæres. Hær.* 80.

ſhould come into a Country of Infidels, and had ability to perſuade them to Chriſtianity, who would ſay he might not uſe it for want of Commiſſion!

To the Eighth: *Luthers* conference with the Devil might be, for ought I know, nothing but a Melancholy Dream: If it were real, the Devil might perſuade *Luther* from the Maſs, hoping by doing ſo to keep him conſtant to it: Or that others would make his diſſuaſion from it an argument for it, (as we ſee *Papiſts* do) and be afraid of following *Luther*, as confeſſing himſelf to have been perſuaded by the Devil.

To the Ninth: *Illiacos intra muros peccatur & extra. Papiſts* are more guilty of this fault than *Proteſtants*. Even this very Author in this very Pamphlet, hath not ſo many leaves as falſifications and Calumnies.

To the Tenth: Let all Men believe the Scripture and that only, and endeavour to believe it in the true ſenſe, and require no more of others, and they ſhall find this not only a better, but the only means to ſuppreſs Hereſie, and reſtore Unity. For he that believes the Scripture ſincerely, and endeavours to believe it in the true ſenſe, cannot poſſibly be an Heretick: And if no more than this were required of any Man, to make him capable of the Churches Communion, then all Men ſo qualified, though they were different in opinion, yet notwithſtanding any ſuch difference, muſt be of neceſſity one in Communion.

THE

THE ANSWER TO THE PREFACE.

TO *the First, and Second.* §. If beginnings be ominous (as they say they are,) D. *Potter* hath cause to look for great store of uningenuous dealing from you; the very first words you speak of him, *viz. That he hath not so much as once truly and really fallen upon the point in question,* being a most unjust and immodest imputation.

2. For the point in question was not that which you pretend, *Whether both* Papists *and* Protestants *can be saved in their several Professions?* But, *whether you may without uncharitableness affirm that Protestancy unrepented destroys Salvation?* For there is no incongruity but that it may be true, *That you and we connot both be Saved:* and yet as True, *That without uncharitableness you cannot pronounce us Damned.* And therefore though the Author of *Charity Mistaken* had proved as strongly as he hath done weakly, *that one Heaven could not receive* Protestants *and* Papists *both,* yet certainly, it was very hastily and unwarrantably, and therefore uncharitably concluded, that *Protestants* were the part that was to be excluded. As, though Jews and Christians cannot both be saved, yet a Jew cannot justly, and therefore not charitably pronounce a Christian Damned.

3. Neither may you or C. *M.* conclude him from hence (as covertly you do,) *an Enemy to Souls by deceiving them with ungrounded false hopes of Salvation*; seeing the hope of Salvation cannot be ungrounded, which requires and supposes belief and practise of all things absolutely necessary

to

to Salvation, and repentance of those Sins and Errors which we fall into by humane frailty: Nor a *friend to indifferency in Religions*, seeing he gives them only hope of pardon of Errors who are desirous, and according to the proportion of their opportunities and abilities industrious to find the truth, or at least truly repentant, that they have not been so. Which Doctrine is very fit to excite men to a constant and impartial search of truth, and very far from teaching them, that it is indifferent what Religion they are of, and without all controversie very honourable to the goodness of God, with which how it can consist, not to be satisfied with his Servants true endeavours to know his will and do it, without full and exact performance, I leave it to you and all good men to judge.

5. You say *he was loth to affirm plainly, that generally both* Catholicks *and* Protestants *may be saved:* which yet is manifest he doth affirm plainly, of *Protestants* throughout his Book; and of Erring *Papists*, that have *sincerely sought the truth and failed of it, and Die with a generalrepentance*: p. 77. 78. And yet you deceive your self, if you conveive he had any other necessity to do so, but only that he thought it true. For we may and do pretend that before Luther *there were many true Churches, besides the* Roman, which agreed not with her: in particular, *The Greek Church.* So that what you say is evidently true, is indeed evidently false. Besides if he had had any necessity to make use of you in this matter, he needed not for this end to say that now in your Church, Salvation may be had; but onely that before *Luthers* time it might be: Then when your means of knowing the truth were not so great, and when your ignorance might be more invincible, and therefore more excusable. So that you may see if you please, it is not for ends, but for the love of truth, that we are thus charitable to you.

6. Neither is it material what you alledge, that they are not *Fundamental Errors*, and then, *what imports it whether we hold them or no, forasmuch as concerns our possibility to be Saved.* As if we were not bound by the Love of God and the love of truth, to be zealous in the defence of all Truths,

Truths, that are any way profitable, though not simply necessary to Salvation. Or as if any good man could satisfie his Conscience with being so affected and resolved. Our Saviour himself having assured us, [a] That *he that shall break one of his least Commandments* (some whereof you pretend are concerning venial sins, and consequently the keeping of them not necessary to Salvation) *and shall so teach men, shall be called the least in the Kingdom of Heaven.*

7. But then it imports very much, though not for the *possibility that you may be saved*, yet for the *probability that you will be so:* because the holding of these Errors, though it did not *merit*, migh yet *occasion* Damnation. As the Doctrine of Indulgences may take away the fear of Purgatory, and the Doctrine of Purgatory the fear of Hell; as you well know it does too frequently. So that though a godly man might be saved *with these* Errors, yet by *means of them*, many are made vicious and so damned. *By them* I say, though *not for them.* No godly Lay-man who is verily persuaded that there is neither impiety nor superstition in the use of your Latin Service, shall be Damned, I hope, for being present at it; yet the want of that Devotion which the frequent hearing the Offices understood, might happily beget in them, the want of that instruction and edification which it might afford them, may very probably hinder the Salvation of many which otherwise might have been saved. Besides, though the matter of an Error may be only something profitable, not necessary, yet the neglect of it may be a damnable Sin. As not to regard Venial Sins is in the Doctrine of your Schools, mortal. Lastly, as Venial Sins, you say, dispose men to mortal; so the erring from some profitable, though lesser truth, may dispose a man to Error in greater matters. As for example: The Belief of the *Popes* Infallibility is, I hope, not unpardonably damnable to every one that holds it; yet if it be a falshood (as most certainly it is) it puts a man into a very congruous disposition to believe *Antichrist*, if he should chance to get into that See.

8. To

8. To the third §] *In his distinction of points Fundamental and not Fundamental, he may seem, you say, to have touched the point, but does not so indeed. Because though he saies there are some points so Fundamental, as that all are obliged to believe them explicitely, yet he tells you not, whether a man may disbelieve any other points of Faith, which are sufficiently presented to his understanding, as Truths revealed by Almighty God.* Touching this matter of *Sufficient Proposal*, if you mean by *sufficiently presented to his understanding as revealed by God*, that which, all things considered, is so proposed to him, that he might and should and would believe it to be true and revealed by God, were it not for some voluntary and avoidable fault of his that interposeth it self between his understanding and the truth presented to it: if you speak of truths thus proposed and rejected, let it be as damnable as you please to deny or disbelieve them. But it amazes me to hear you say, that Dr. *Potter* declines this Question, seeing the Light it self is not more clear, then Dr. *Potters* Declaration of himself (p. 245, 246. *&c.* of his Book) beginning his discourse thus. "*It seems Fundamental to the Faith, and for the Salvation of* "*every member of the Church, that he acknowledge and believe* "*all such points of Faith, as whereof he may be convinced that* "*they belong to the Doctrine of Jesus Christ.*

"To this conviction he requires three things. *Clear* "*Revelation; Sufficient Proposition, and Capacity and under-* "*standing in the hearer. For want of clear Revelation, he* "*frees the Church before Christ and the Disciples of Christ* "*from any damnable Error, though they believed not those* "*things which he that should now deny were no Christian. To* "*sufficient Proposition, he requires two things.* 1. *That the* "*points be perspicuously laid open in themselves.* 2. *So forci-* "*bly, as may serve to remove reasonable doubts to the contra-* "*ry, and to satisfie a teachable mind concerning it, against the* "*Principles in which he hath been bred to the contrary. This* "*Proposition he says is not limited to the* Pope *or Church, but* "*extended to all means whatsoever, by which a man may be* "*convinced in Conscience, that the matter proposed is Divine* "*Revelation; which he professes to be done sufficiently, not-*

"*only*

"*only when his Conscience doth expresly bear witness to the* "*truth; but when it would do so, if it were not choaked, and* "*blinded by some unruly and unmortified lust in the will. The* "*difference being not great between him that is wilfully blind,* "*and him that knowingly gainsaieth the Truth. The 3 thing* "*he requires is Capacity and Ability to apprehend the Proposal,* "*and the Reasons of it: the want whereof excuseth Fools and* "*Madmen,* &c. *But where there is no such impediment, and* "*the will of God is sufficiently propounded, there* (saith he) *he* "*that opposeth is convinced of Error; and he who is thus* "*convinced is an Heretick: and Heresie is a work of the* "*Flesh, which excludeth from Salvation,* (he means without "Repentance,) *And hence it followeth, that it is Funda-* "*mental to a Christians Faith, and necessary for his Salvati-* "*on, that he believe all revealed truths of God, whereof he* "*may be convinced that they are from God.*

Again, it is almost as strange to me, why you should say, this was the only thing in question, *Whether a Man may deny or disbelieve any point of Faith, sufficiently presented to his understanding as a truth revealed by God.* For to say, that any thing is a thing in question, methinks at the first hearing of the words, imports, that it is by some affirmed, and denied by others. Now you affirm I grant, but what *Protestant* ever denied, that it was a sin to give God the lie? Which is the first and most obvious sense of these Words. Or which of them ever doubted, that to disbelieve is then a fault, when the matter is so proposed to a Man, that he might and should, and were it not for his own fault, would believe it? Certainly he that questions either of these, justly deserves to have his wits called in question. Produce any one *Protestant* that ever did so, and I will give you leave to say it is the only thing in question. But then I must tell you, that your ensuing Argument, viz: *To deny a truth witnessed by God is damnable, But of two that disagree, one must of necessity deny some such truth, Therefore one only can be saved*; is built upon a ground clean different from this postulate. For though it be always a fault to deny what either I do know, or should know, to be testified by God; yet that which by a

cleanly conveyance you put in the place hereof, *To deny a Truth witnessed by God* simply, without the circumstance of *being known or sufficienly proposed,* is so far from being certainly Damnable, that it may be many times done without any the least fault at all. As if God should testifie something to a man in the *Indies,* I that had no assurance of this testification should not be obliged to believe it. For in such cases the Rule of the Law has place, *Idem est non esse & non apparere:* not to be at all and not to appear to me, is to me all one. *If I had not come and spoken unto you* (saith our Saviour) *you had had no sin.*

10. As little necessity is there for that which follows: *That of two disagreeing in a matter of Faith one must deny some such truth.* Whether by [such] you understand, *Testified at all by God*; or *testified and sufficiently propounded.* For it is very possible the matter in controversie may be such a thing wherein God hath not at all declared himself, or not so fully and clearly as to oblige all Men to hold one way; and yet be so overvalued by the parties in variance, as to be esteemed a matter *of Faith,* and one of those things of which our Saviour says, *He that believeth not shall be Damned.* Who sees not that it is possible two Churches may excommunicate and Damn each other for keeping *Christmas* Ten days sooner or later; as well as *Victor* excommunicated the Churches of *Asia,* for differing from him about *Easter-Day?* And yet I believe you will confess, that God had not then declared himself about *Easter*; nor hath now about *Christmas.* Anciently some good Catholick Bishops excommunicated and Damned others for *holding there were Antipodes:* and in this question I would fain know on which side was the sufficient proposal. *The contra-Remonstrants* differ from the *Remonstrants* about the points of Predetermination as a matter of Faith: I would know in this thing also, which way God hath declared himself; whether for Predetermination or against it. *Stephen Bishop of* Rome held it as a matter of Faith and Apostolick tradition, *That Hereticks gave true Baptism*: Others there were, and they as good Catholicks as he, that held that this was neither matter of *Faith* nor matter of *Truth. Justin Martyr* and

and *Irenæus* held the Doctrine of the *Millenaries* as a matter of *Faith*: and though *Justin Martyr* deny it, yet you, I hope, will affirm, that some good Christians held the contrary. S. *Augustine*, I am sure, held *the communicating of Infants*, as much Apostolick tradition, as the Baptising of them: whether the Bishop and the Church of *Rome* of his time, held so too, or held otherwise, I desire you to determine. But, sure I am, the Church of *Rome* at this present holds the contrary. The same S. *Austin* held it no matter of Faith, that the *Bishops of* Rome *were Judges of Appeals* from all parts of the Church Catholick, no not in *Major Causes and Major Persons*: whether the Bishop or Church of *Rome* did then hold the contrary do you resolve me; but now I am resolved they do so. In all these differences, the point in question is esteemed and proposed by one side at least as a matter of *Faith*, and by the other rejected as not so: and either this is to disagree in matters of Faith, or you will have no means to shew that we do disagree. Now then to shew you how weak and sandy the Foundation is, on which the whole Fabrick both of your Book and Church depends, answer me briefly to this *Dilemma*. Either in these oppositions one of the opposite Parts erred damnably, and denied Gods truth sufficiently propounded or they did not. If they did, than they which do deny Gods truth sufficiently propounded, may go to heaven; and then you are rash and uncharitable in excluding us, though we were guilty of this fault. If not, then there is no such necessity, that of two disagreeing about a matter of Faith, one should deny Gods truth sufficiently propounded. And so the Major and Minor of your Argument, are proved false. Yet, though they were as true as Gospel, and as evident as Mathematical Principles, the conclusion (so impertinent is it to the Premises) might still be false. For that which naturally issues from these propositions is not. *Therefore one only can be saved*: But, *Therefore one of them does something that is damnable*. But with what Logick or what Charity you can infer either as the immediate production of the former premises, or as a Corollary from this conclusion, Therefore *one only can be sa-*

ved, I do not understand; unless you will pretend that this consequence is good, such a one doth something damnable, therefore he shall certainly be damned: which whether it be not to overthrow the Article of our Faith, which promises remission of sins upon repentance, and consequently to ruin the Gospel of Christ, I leave it to the *Pope* and the *Cardinals* to determine. For if against this it be alledged, that no man can repent of the sin wherein he Dies: This muce I have already stopped, by shewing that if it be a sin of Ignorance, this is no way incongruous.

13. Ad 6. §.] In your sixth *Parag.* I let all pass saving only this, *That a persuasion that men of different Religions* (you must mean Christians of different Opinions or Communions) *may be saved, is a most pernicious Heresie, and even a ground of Atheism.* What strange extractions Chymistry can make I know not; but sure I am, he that by reason would infer this Conclusion, *That there is no God*; from this ground, *That God will save men in different Religions*, must have a higher strain of Logick, than you (for I have hitherto made shew of. In my apprehension, the other part of the contradiction, *That there is a God*, should much rather follow from it; and I say and will maintain, that to say, *That Christians of different Opinions and Communions* (*such I mean, who hold all those things that are simply necessary to Salvation*) *may not obtain Pardon for the Errors wherein they Die ignorantly, by a general Repentance*; *is so far from being a ground of* Atheism, *that to say the contrary, is to cross in Diameter a main Article of our Creed, and to overthrow the Gospel of Christ.*

14. Ad 7. §.] To what you say, of some *Protestants* that *hold it necessary to be able to prove a perpetual Visible Church distinct from Yours.* I answer, Some perhaps undertake to do so, as a matter of courtesie; but I believe you will be much to seek for any one that holds it necessary. For though you say that Christ hath promised there shall be a Perpetual Visible Church; yet you your selves do not pretend that he hath promised there shall be Histories and Records always extant of the Professors of it in

all

all Ages: nor that he hath any where enjoyned us to read thoſe Hiſtories that we may be able to ſhew them.

17. To your enſuing demands, though ſome of them be very captious and enſnaring; yet I will give you as clear and plain and Ingenuous Anſwers as poſſibly I can.

18. Ad 11. §.] To the Firſt then, about *the Perpetuity of the viſible Church*, my Anſwer is: That I believe our Saviour, ever ſince his Aſcenſion, hath had in ſome place or other a Viſible true Church on Earth: I mean a Company of Men, that profeſſed at leaſt ſo much truth as was abſolutely neceſſary for their Salvation. And I believe that there will be ſomewhere or other ſuch a Church to the Worlds end. But the contrary Doctrine I do at no hand believe to be a damnable Hereſie.

19. Ad 12. §.] To the Second, what *Viſible Church there was before* Luther *diſagreeing from the* Roman? I anſwer, that before *Luther* there were many Viſible Churches in many things diſagreeing from the *Roman*: But not that the whole Catholick Church diſagreed from Her, becauſe She her ſelf was a Part of the Whole, though much corrupted. And to undertake to name a Catholick Church diſagreeing from Her, is to make her no Part of it, which we do not, nor need not pretend. And *for men agreeing with* Proteſtants *in all points*, we will then produce them, when you ſhall either prove it neceſſary to be done, which you know we abſolutely deny; or when you ſhall produce a perpetual ſucceſſion of Profeſſors, which in all points have agreed with you, and diſagreed from you in nothing. But this my promiſe, to deal plainly with you, I conceive, and ſo intended it to be very like his, who undertook to drink up the Sea, upon condition, that he, to whom the promiſe was made, ſhould firſt ſtop the Rivers from runing in. For this unreaſonable requeſt which you make to us is to your ſelves ſo impoſſible, that in the very next Age after the Apoſtles, you will never be able to name a Man, whom you can prove to have agreed with you in all things, nay (if you ſpeak of ſuch, whoſe Works are extant and unqueſtioned) whom we cannot prove to have diſagreed from you.

you in many things. Which I am so certain of, that I will venture my Credit, and my Life upon it.

20. Ad 13. §.] To the Third, *Whether, seeing there cannot be assigned any Visible true Church distinct from the* Roman, *it follows not that She Erred not Fundamentally.* I say, in our sense of the word *Fundamental*, it does follow. For if it be true, that there was then no Church distinct from the *Roman*, then it must be, either because there was no Church at all, which we deny: Or because the *Roman* Church was the whole Church, which we also deny: Or because She was a Part of the Whole, which we grant. And if She were a true Part of the Church than She retained those truths which were simply necessary to Salvation, and held no Errors which were inevitably and unpardonably destructive of it. For this is precisely necessary to constitute any man or any Church a member of the Church Catholick. In our sense therefore of the Word *Fundamental*, I hope She erred not Fundamentally: but in your sense of the word, I fear she did. That is, She held something to be Divine Revelation, which was not; something not to be which was.

21. Ad 14. §.] To the Fourth. *How it could be damnable to maintain her Errors, if they were not Fundamental?* I answer. 1. Though it were not damnable, yet if it were a fault, it was not to be done. For a Venial sin, with you is not damnable; yet you say, it is not to be committed for the procuring any good. *Non est faciendum malum vel minimum, ut eveniat bonum vel maximum.* 2. It is damnable to maintain an error against Conscience, though the error in it self, and to him that believes it, be not damnable. Nay, the profession not only of an error, but even of a truth, if not believed, when you think on it again, I believe you will confess to be a mortal sin; unless you will say, Hypocrisie and Simulation in Religion is not so. 3. Though we say, the Errors of the *Roman* Church were not destructive of Salvation, but pardonable even to them that Dyed in them, upon a general repentance: yet we deny not but in *themselves they were damnable.* Nay, the very saying they were pardonable,

implie

implies they needed pardon, and therefore in themſelves were damnable: damnable *meritoriouſly*, though not *effectually*. As a poyſon may be deadly in it ſelf, and yet not kill him, that together with the Poyſon takes an Antidote: or as Fellony may deſerve Death, and yet not bring it on him that obtains the Kings Pardon.

22. Ad 15. §] To the Fifth. *How they can be excuſed from Schiſm, who forſook her Communion upon pretence of Errors which were not damnable*! I anſwer. All that we forſake in you, is only the Belief, and Practice, and profeſſion of your Errors. Hereupon, you caſt us out of your Communion. And then with a ſtrange, and contradictious and ridiculous Hypocriſie, complain that we forſake it. As if a man ſhould thruſt his friend out of doors, and then be offended at his departure. But for us not to forſake the belief of your Errors, having diſcovered them to be Errors, was impoſſible; and therefore to do ſo could not be damnable, believing them to be Errors. Not to forſake the practice and profeſſion of them, had been damnable Hereſie; ſuppoſing that (which you vainly run away with, and take for granted) thoſe Errors in themſelves were not damnable. Now to do ſo, and as matters now ſtand, not to forſake your Communion, is apparently contradictious: ſeeing the condition of your Communion is, that we muſt profeſs to believe all your Doctrines, not only not to be damnable Errors (which will not content you,) but alſo to be certain and neceſſary and revealed truths. So that to demand why we forſake your Communion upon pretence of Errors which were not damnable, is in effect to demand why we forſook it upon our forſaking it! For to pretend that there are Errors in your Church though not damnable, is *ipſo facto* to forſake your Communion, and to do that which both in your account, and as you think in Gods account, puts him as does ſo, out of your Communion. So that either you muſt free your Church from requiring the belief of any Error whatſoever, damnable and not damnable, or whether you will or no, you muſt free us from Schiſm. For Schiſm there cannot be in leaving

leaving your Communion, unless we were obliged to continue in it. Man cannot be obliged by Man, but to what either formally or virtually he is obliged by God, for all just power is from God. God the Eternal truth neither can nor will oblige us to believe any the least and the most innocent falshood to be a Divine truth, that is, to Err; nor, to profess a known Error, which is to lie. So that if you require the belief of any Error among the conditions of your Communion, our obligation to communicate with you ceaseth, and so the imputation of Schism to us, vanisheth into nothing: but lies heavy upon you for making our separation from you just and necessary, by requiring unnecessary and unlawful conditions of your Communion. Hereafter therefore, I intreat you, let not your demand be, how could we forsake your Communion without Schism, seeing you Erred not damnably? But how we could do so without Schism, seeing you Erred not at all? which if either you do prove, or we cannot disprove it, we will (I at least will for my part) return to your Communion, or subscribe my self Schismatick. In the mean time, μένομεν ὥσπερ ἐσμέν, we continue where we are.

23. Yet notwithstanding all your Errors we do not renounce your Communion *totally* and absolutely, but only leave Communicating with you in the practice and profession of your Errors. The tryal whereof will be to propose some form of worshiping God, taken wholly out of Scripture; and herein if we refuse to joyn with you, then, and not till then, may we justly say we have utterly and absolutely abandoned your Communion.

25. Ad 17. §.] To the Seventh, *Whether Error against any one truth sufficiently propounded as testified by God, destroy not the Nature and Unity of Faith, or at least, is not a grievous offence excluding Salvation* ! I answer, if you suppose, as you seem to do the proposition so sufficient, that the party to whom it is made is convinced that it is from God, so that the denyal of it involves also with it the denial of Gods veracity; any such Error destroys both Faith and Salvation. But if the Proposal be only so sufficient,

sufficient, not, that the party to whom it is made is convinced, but only that he should, and but for his own fault would have been convinced of the Divine verity of the Doctrine proposed: The crime then is not so great, for the belief of Gods veracity may well consist with such an Error. Yet a fault I confess it is and (without Repentance) damnable, if all circumstances considered the proposal be sufficient. But then I must tell you that the proposal of the present *Roman* Church is only pretended to be sufficient for this purpose, but is not so: especially all the Rayes of the Divinity, which they pretend to shine so conspicuously in her proposals, being so darkned and even extinguished with a cloud of contradiction, from Scripture, Reason, and the Ancient Church.

26. Ad 18. §.] To the Eighth. *How of disagreeing* Protestants, *both parts may hope for Salvation, seeing some of them must needs Err against some Truth testified by God?* I answer, 1. The most disagreeing *Protestants* that are, yet thus far agree, that these Books of Scripture which were never doubted of in the Church, are the undoubted Word of God, and a perfect rule of Faith. 2. That the sense of them, which God intended, whatsoever it is, is certainly true. So that they believe implicitely even those very truths against which they Err; and why an implicit Faith in Christ and his Word, should not suffice as well as an implicit Faith in your Church, I have desired to be resolved by many of your Side, but never could.

3. That they are to use their best endeavours to believe the Scripture in the true sense and to live according to it. This if they perform (as I hope many on all Sides do) truly and sincerely, it is impossible but that they should believe aright in all things necessary to Salvation: that is, in all those things which appertain to the Covenant between God and man in Christ, for so much, is not only plainly but frequently contained in Scripture. And believing aright touching the Covenant, if they for their parts perform the condition required of them, which is sincere obedience, why should they not expect that God will perform his promise and give them Salvation?

For, as for other things which lie without the Covenant, and are therefore less necessary, if by reason of the seeming conflict which is oftentimes between Scripture and Reason, and Authority on the one side, and Scripture, Reason, and Authority on the other; if by reason of the variety of tempers, Abilities, Educations, and unavoidable prejudices, whereby mens understandings are variously formed and fashioned, they do embrace several Opinions, whereof some must be erroneous; to say that God will Damn them for such Errors, who are lovers of him, and lovers of truth, is to rob man of his comfort, and God of his goodness; it is to make Man desperate and God a Tyrant. *But they deny Truths testified by God, and therefore shall be Damned.* Yes, if they knew them to be thus testified by him, and yet would deny them, that were to give God the lie, and questionless damnable. But if you should deny a truth which God had testified but only to a Man in the *Indies*, (as I said before) and this testification you had never heard of, or at least had no sufficient reason to believe that God had so testified, would not you think it a hard case to be Damned for such a denial? Yet consider I pray a little more attentively the difference between them, and you will presently acknowledge, the question between them is not at any time, or in any thing, Whether God says true or no? or whether he says this or no? But supposing he says this, and says true, whether he means this or no? As for example, between *Lutherans*, *Calvinists*, and *Zwinglians*, it is agreed that Christ spake these Words, *This is my Body*; and that whatsoever he meant in saying so is true: But what he meant and how he is to be understood, that's the question. So that though some of them deny a truth by God intended, yet you can with no reason or justice accuse them of denying the truth of Gods Testimony, unless you can plainly shew that God hath declared, and that plainly and clearly, what was his meaning in these Words. I say *plainly and clearly*. For he that speaks obscurely and ambiguously, and no where declares himself plainly, sure he hath no reason to be much offended if he be mistaken. When therefore you can shew, that

in

in this and all other their Controversies, God hath interposed his Testimony on one side or other; so that either they do see it, and will not; or were it not for their own voluntary and avoidable fault, might and should see it and do not; let all such Errors be as damnable as you please to make them. In the mean while, if they suffer themselves neither to be betraid into their Errors, nor kept in them by any sin of their will; if they do their best endeavour to free themselves from all Errors, and yet fail of it through humane frailty; so well am I perswaded of the goodness of God, that if in me alone, should meet a confluence of all such Errors of all the *Protestants* in the World, that were thus qualified, I should not be so much afraid of them all, as I should be to ask pardon for them. For, whereas that which you affright us with of calling Gods Veracity in Question, is but a Panick fear, a fault that no man thus qualified, is, or can be guilty of; to ask pardon of simple and purely involuntary errors is tacitely to imply that God is angry with us for them, and that to impute to him the strange Tyranny of *requiring Brick, when he gives no Straw*; *of expecting to gather, where he strewed not*; *to reap where he sowed not*: of being offended with us for not doing what he knows we cannot do. This I say upon a supposition, that they do their best endeavours to know Gods will and do it; which he that denys to be possible, knows not what he says; for he says in effect, that Men cannot do, what they can do; for to do what a Man can do, is to do his best endeavour. But because this supposition, though certainly possible, is very rare, and admirable, I say secondly, that I am verily perswaded, that God will not impute Errors to them, as sins, who use such a measure of industry, in finding truth, as humane *prudence* and ordinary *discretion* (their abilities and opportunities, their distractions and hindrances, and all other things considered) shall advise them unto, in a matter of such consequence. But if herein also we fail, then our Errors begin to be malignant, and justly imputable, as offences against God, and that love of his truth which he requires

in us. You will say then, that for those Erring *Protestants*, which are in this case, which evidently are far the greater part, they sin damnably in Erring, and therefore there is little hope of their Salvation. To which I answer, that the consequence of this Reason, is somewhat strong against a *Protestant*; but much weakned by coming out of the Mouth of a *Papist*. For all Sins with you are not damnable. But yet out of courtesie to you, we will remove this rubb out of your way; and for the present suppose them *mortal Sins*; and is there then no hope of Salvation, for him that commits them? Not, you will say, if he Die in them without repentance; and such *Protestants* you speak of, *who without Repentance Die in their Errors*. Yea but what if they Die in their Errors with Repentance? than I hope you will have Charity enough to think they may be saved. *Charity Mist.* takes it indeed for granted, that this supposition is distructive of it self; and that it is impossible, and incongruous, that a Man should repent of those Errors wherein he Dies; or Die in those whereof he repents. But it was wisely done of Him to take it for granted; for most certainly He could not have spoken one word of sense for the confirmation of it. For seeing *Protestants* believe, as well as you, Gods infinite and most admirable perfections in himself, more than most worthy of all possible love: seeing they believe, as well as you, his infinite goodness to them, in Creating them of nothing; in Creating them according to his own Image; in Creating all things for their use and benefit; in streaming down his Favours on them every moment of their Lives; in designing them, if they serve him, to infinite and Eternal Happiness; in Redeeming them, not with corruptible things, but the Pretious Blood of his beloved Son: seeing they believe, as well as you, His infinite goodness, and Patience towards them, in expecting their Conversion; in Wooing, Alluring, Leading, and by all means, which his Wisdom can Suggest unto him, and Mans nature is capable of, drawing them to Repentance and Salvation: Seeing they believe these things as well as you, and for ought you know,

In the place above quoted.

know, consider them as much as you, (and if they do not, it is not their Religion, but they that are to blame,) what can hinder, but that the consideration of Gods most infinite goodness to them, and their own almost infinite wickedness against him, Gods Spirit cooperating with them, may raise them to a true and sincere and a cordial love of God? And seeing sorrow for having injured or offended the Person beloved, or when we fear we may have offended him, is the most natural effect of true love; what can hinder, but that love which hath oftimes constrained them, to lay down their lives for God (which our Saviour assures us is the noblest Sacrifice we can offer,) may produce in them an universal sorrow for all their sins, both which they know they have committed, and which they fear they may have? In which number, their being negligent, or not dispassionate, or not unprejudicate enough in seeking the truth, and the effect thereof, their Errors, if they be sins, cannot but be compriz'd. In a word, what should hinder, but that, that Prayer---- *Delicta sua quis intelligit? who can understand his faults? Lord cleanse thou me from my secret sins,* may be heard and accepted by God, as well from a *Protestant* that Dies in some Errors, as from a *Papist* that Dies in some other sins of Ignorance, which perhaps he might more easily have discovered to be sins, than a *Protestant* could his Errors to be Errors? As well from a *Protestant,* that held some Error, which (as he conceived) Gods Word and his Reason, (which is also in some sort Gods Word) led him unto; as from a *Dominican,* who perhaps took up his opinion upon trust, not because he had reason to believe it true, but because it was the opinion of his *Order*; for the same man if he had light upon another Order, would in all probability, have been of the other Opinion. For what else is the cause, that generally *all the Dominicans are of one Opinion, and all the Jesuits of the other?* I say, from a *Dominican* who took up his Opinion upon trust; and that such an Opinion (if we believe the writers of your Order) as if it be granted true, it were not a point matter, what Opinions any man held, or what actions

any

any man did, for the best would be as bad as the worst, and the worst as good as the best. And yet such is the partiality of your Hypocrisie, that of disagreeing *Papists*, neither shall deny the truth testified by God, but both may hope for Salvation: but of disagreeing *Protestants* (though they differ in the same thing,) one side must deny Gods Testimony and be incapable of Salvation. That a *Dominican* through culpable negligence, living and dying in his Error, may repent of it, though he knows it not; or be saved though he do not: But if a *Protestant* do the very same thing, in the very same point, and Die in his Error, his case is desperate. The Sum of all that hath been said to this Demand is this. 1. That no Erring *Protestant* denys any truth testified by God, under this formality, *as testified by him*; nor which they know or believe to be testified by him. And therefore it is a horrible Calumny in you to say, *They call Gods Veracity in question.* For Gods undoubted and unquestioned Veracity, is to them the ground, why they hold all they do hold: neither do they hold any Opinion so stifly, but they will forgoe it rather than this one, *That all which God says is true.* 2. God hath not so clearly and plainly declared himself in most of these things which are in controversie between *Protestants*, but that an honest man, whose heart is right to God, and one that is a true lover of God, and of his truth, may by reason of the conflict of contrary Reasons on both sides, very easily, and therefore excusably mistake, and embrace Error for Truth, and reject Truth for Error. 3. If any *Protestant* or *Papist* be betrayed into, or kept in any Error, by any sin of his will (as it is to be feared many Millions are) such Error is, as the cause of it, sinful and damnable: yet not exclusive of all hope of Salvation, but pardonable if discovered, upon a particular explicite repentance; if not discovered, upon a general and implicite repentance for all Sins known and unknown: in which number all sinful Errors must of necessity be contained.

27. Ad 19. §.] To the Ninth. Wherein you are so urgent for a *particular Catalogue of Fundamentals*: I answer

swer almost in your own words, that we also constantly urge and require to have a particular Catalogue of your Fundamentals, whether they be written Verities, or unwritten Traditions, or Church Definitions? all which, you say integrate the material Object of your Faith: In a word of all such Points as are defined and sufficiently proposed; so that whosoever denys, or doubts of any of them, is certainly in the state of damnation. A Catalogue I say in particular of the Propositals: and not only some general definition, or description, under which you lurk deceitfully, of what, and what only is sufficiently proposed: wherein yet you do not very well agree. For many of you hold the *Popes* Proposital *Ex Cathedra*, to be sufficient and obliging: Some a Council without a *Pope*: Some, of neither of them severally, but only both together: Some not this neither in matter of manners, which *Bellarmine* acknowledges, and tells us it is all one in effect, as if they denyed it sufficient in matter of Faith: Some not in matter of Faith, neither think this Proposital Infallible, without the acceptation of the Church Universal: Some deny the Infallibility of the Present Church, and only make the Tradition of all Ages the *Infallible Propounder*. Yet if you were agreed *what and what only is the Infallible Propounder*, this would not satisfie us; nor yet to say, *that All is Fundamental which is propounded sufficiently by him*. For though agreeing in this, yet you might still disagree *whether such or such a Doctrine were propounded or not: or if propounded, whether sufficiently, or only insufficiently*. And it is so known a thing, that in many points you do so, that I assure my self you will not deny it. Therefore we constantly urge and require a particular and perfect Inventory of all these Divine Revelations, which you say *are sufficiently propounded, and that such a one to which all of your Church will subscribe as neither redundant, nor deficient*; which when you give in with one hand, you shall receive a particular Catalogue of such Points as I call *Fundamental* with the other. Neither may you think me unreasonable in this demand, seeing upon such a particular Catalogue of your sufficient Propositals

This great diversity of Opinions among you, touching this matter, if any man doubt of it, let him read *Franciscus Picus Mirandula in l. Theorem. in Expositi. Theor. quarti.* and *Tho. Waldensis. Tom. 3. De Sacramentalibus. doct. 3. fol. 5.* and he shall be fully satisfied that I have done you no injury.

as

as much depends, as upon a particular Catalogue of our *Fundamentals*. As for example. Whether or no a man do not Err in some point defined and sufficiently propoſed: and whether or no those that differ among you, differ in *Fundamentals*; which if they do *One Heaven* (by your own Rule) *cannot receive them All*. Perhaps you will here complain, that this is not to satisfie your demand, but to avoid it, and to put you off as the *Areopagites* did hard Causes *ad diem longissimum*, and bid you come again a Hundred Years hence: To deal truly, I did so intend it should be. Neither can you say, my dealing with you is injurious, seeing I require nothing of you, but that, what you require of others, you should shew it possible to be done, and just and necessary to be required. For, for my part, I have great reason to suspect, it is neither the one nor the other. For whereas the Verities which are delivered in Scripture, may be very fitly divided into *such as were written because they were necessary to be believed*, Of which rank are those only which constitute and make up the Covenant between God and Man in Christ: and then *such as are necessary to be believed not in themselves but only by accident, because they were written*. Of which rank are many matters of History, of Prophecy, of Mystery, of Policy, of Oeconomy, and such like, which are evidently not *intrinsecal* to the Covenant. Now to sever exactly and punctally these Verities one from the other: what is *necessary in it self* and antecedently to the writing, from what is but only profitable in it self, and *necessary only because written*, is a business of extream great difficulty, and extream little necessity. For first he that will go about to distinguish especially in the story of our Saviour, what was written because it was *profitable*, from what was written because *necessary*, shall find an intricate peice of business of it, and almost impossible that he should be certain he hath done it, when he hath done it. And then it is apparently unnecessary to go about it, seeing he that believes all, certainly believes all that is necessary. And he that doth not believe all (I mean all the undoubted parts of the undoubted Books of Scripture) can hardly believe

believe any, neither have we reaſon to believe he doth ſo. So that, that *Proteſtants* give you not a Catalogue of *Fundamentals*, it is not from Tergiverſation (as you ſuſpect, who for want of Charity to them always ſuſpect the worſt,) but from Wiſdom and Neceſſity. For they may very eaſily Err in doing it; becauſe though all which is neceſſary be plain in Scripture, yet all which is plain is not therefore written becauſe it was neceſſary. For what greater neceſſity was there that I ſhould know S. *Paul left his Cloak at* Troas, than thoſe *Worlds of Miracles*, which our Saviour did, which were never written. And when they had done it, it had been to no purpoſe; There being as matters now ſtand, as great neceſſity, of believing thoſe truths of Scripture, which are not Fundamental, as thoſe that are. You ſee then what reaſon we have to decline this hard labour, which you a rigid Task-maſter have here put upon us. Yet inſtead of giving you a Catalogue of Fundamentals, with which I dare ſay you are reſolved before it come, never to be ſatisfied, I will ſay that to you, which if you pleaſe may do you as much ſervice; and this it is. That it is ſufficient for any Mans Salvation that he believe the Scripture: That he endeavour to believe it in the true ſenſe of it, as far as concerns his Duty: And that he conform his Life unto it either by Obedience or Repentance. He that does ſo (and all *Proteſtants* according to the *Dictamen* of their Religion ſhould do ſo,) may be ſecure that he cannot Err Fundamentally. And they that do ſo cannot differ in Fundamentals. So that notwithſtanding their differences, and your preſumption, *the ſame Heaven may receive them All.*

28. Ad 20. §.] Your Tenth and laſt requeſt is, *to know diſtinctly what is the Doctrine of the* Proteſtant *Engliſh Church, in theſe points; and what my private Opinion.* Which ſhall be ſatisfied when the Church of *England* hath expreſſed her ſelf in them; or when you have told us what is the Doctrine of your Church, in the Queſtion of *Predetermination*, or the *Immaculate Conception.*

29. Ad 21. and 22. §.] These answers I hope in the judgment of indifferent men are satisfactory to your Questions though not to you, For I have either answered them, or given you a reason why I have not. Neither, for ought I can see, *have I flitted from things considered in their own nature, to accidental or rare Circumstances,* But told you my Opinion plainly what I thought of your Errors in themselves: and what as they were qualified or malignified with good or bad Circumstances.

CHAP. I.

The ANSWER to the First CHAPTER.

Shewing that the Adversary grants the Old Question and proposeth a New one. And that there is no reason, why among Men of different Opinions and Communions, one Side only can be saved.

1. AD 1. §.] *Protestants* are here accused of uncharitableness while they accuse you of it: and you make good this charge in this manner. Protestants *charge the* Roman *Church with many and great Errors, judge reconciliation of their Doctrine and ours impossible, and that for them who are convicted in Conscience of her Errors, not to forsake her in them, or to be reconciled unto her, is damnable. Therefore if* Roman Catholicks *be convicted in Conscience of the Errors of* Protestants, *they may and must judge a reconciliation with them damnable, and consequently, to judge so is no more uncharitable in them, than it is in* Protestants *to judge as they do.*

CHIL. All this I grant; nor would any *Protestant* accuse you of *want of Charity* if you went no further. If you be perswaded in Conscience that our Religion is erroneous, the profession of it, though in it self most true, to you would be damnable. For it is no uncharitableness to judge *Hypocrisie a damnable Sin.* Let Hypocrite then and Dissemblers on both Sides pass. It is not towards

towards them, but good Christians; not to *Protestant* Professors but Believers, that we require your Charity. What think you of those that believe so verily the truth of our Religion, that they are resolved to Die in it, and if occasion were to Die for it? What Charity have you for them? What think you of those that in the Days of our Fathers, laid down their Lives for it? are you content that they shall be saved, or do you hope they may be so? Will you grant that notwithstanding their Errors, there is good hope they might Die with Repentance? and if they did so, certainly they are saved. If you will do so, this Controversie is ended. No man will hereafter charge you with *want of Charity*. This is as much as either we give you, or expect of you, while you remain in your Religion. But then you must leave abusing silly People, with telling them (as your fashion is) that *Protestants confess* Papists *may be saved, but* Papists *confess not so much of* Protestants; *therefore yours is the safer way, and in Wisdom and Charity to our own Souls we are bound to follow it.* For granting this, you grant as much hope of Salvation to *Protestants*, as *Protestants* do to you. If you will not, but still affirm, as C. *M.* does, that *Protestants* (not dissemblers but *believers*) *without a particular Repentance of their Religion cannot be saved:* This I say, is a *want of Charity*.

But I pray Sir what dependance is there between these Propositions: We that hold *Protestant* Religion false should be damned if we should profess it, Therefore they also shall be damned, that hold it true? Just as if you should conclude, *Because he that doubts is Damned if he Eat*, Therefore he that does not doubt is damned also if he Eat. And therefore though your Religion to us, or ours to you, if professed against Conscience would be damnable; yet may it well be uncharitable to define it shall be so, to them that profess either this or that according to Conscience.

3. Ad 3. 4. 5. 6. §.] C. M. *Our meaning is not, that we give* Protestants *over to reprobation; that we offer no Prayers in hope of their Salvation; that we hold their Case desperate. God forbid*, &c.

CHIL. I wish with all my Heart that you had expressed your self in this matter more fully and plainly. Yet that which you say, doth plainly enough afford us these Corollaries. 1. That whatsoever *Protestant* wanteth Capacity, or having it, wanteth sufficient means of instruction to convince his Conscience of the falshood of his own, and the truth of the *Roman* Religion, by the confession of his most rigid Adversaries, may be saved, notwithstanding any Error in his Religion. 2. That nothing hinders but that a *Protestant* Dying a *Protestant* may Die with contrition for all his Sins. 3. That if he Die with Contrition, he may and shall be saved.

4. All these acknowledgments we have from you, while you are, as you say, stating, but, as I conceive granting the very point in question. So that according to your Doctrine, the heavy sentence shall remain upon *such only, as either were, or but for their own fault, might have been sufficiently convinced of the truth of your Religion, and the falshood of their own, and yet Die in it without contrition.* Which Doctrine if you would stand to, and not pull down, and pull back with one hand, what you give and build with the other, this controversie were ended; and I should willingly acknowledge, that which follows in your fourth paragraph; *That you allow* Protestants *as much Charity as* D. Potter *allows you.* But then I must intreat you to alter the *argument of this Chapter,* and not to go about to give us reasons, *why amongst Men of different Religions, one side only can be saved absolutely,* which your Reasons drive at: But you must temper the crudeness of your Assertion by saying, *One Side only can be saved, unless want of Conviction, or else Repentance excuse the other.* Besides you must not only abstain from damning any *Protestant* in particular, but from affirming in general, that Protestants *Dying in their Religion cannot be saved*; for you must always remember to add this caution, unless *they were excusably ignorant of the falshood of it, or Died with contrition.* And then considering that you cannot know, whether or no, all things considered, they were convinced sufficiently of the truth of your Religion and the falshood

falſhood of their own, you are obliged by Charity to judge the beſt, and hope they are not. Conſidering again, that notwithſtanding their Errors, they may Die with contrition, and that it is no way improbable that they do ſo, and the contrary you cannot be certain of, You are bound in Charity to judge and hope they do ſo. Conſidering thirdly and laſtly, that if they Die not with *Contrition*, yet it is very probable they may Die with *Attrition*, and that this pretence of yours, that *Contrition will ſerve without actual Confeſſion, but Attrition will not*, is but a Nicety or Phanſie, or rather to give it the true name, a Device of your own, to ſerve ends and purpoſes; (God having no where declared himſelf, but that whereſoever he will accept of that Repentance, which you are pleaſed to call *Contrition*, he will accept of that which you call *Attrition*; For though he like beſt the bright Flaming Holocauſt of Love, yet he rejects not, he quenches not the ſmoaking Flax of that Repentance (if it be true and effectual) which proceeds from hope and fear:) Theſe things I ſay, conſidered, (unleſs you will have the Charity of your Doctrine riſe up in judgment againſt your uncharitable Practice) you muſt not only not be peremptory, in damning *Proteſtants*, but you muſt hope well of their Salvation: and out of this hope, you muſt do for them as well as others, thoſe, as you conceive, Charitable offices, of Praying, giving Alms and offering Sacrifice, which uſually you do, for thoſe of whoſe Salvation you are well and Charitably perſuaded; (for I believe you will never conceive ſo well of Proteſtants, as to aſſure your ſelves they go directly to Heaven.) Theſe things when you do I ſhall believe you think as Charitably as you ſpeak. But until then, as he ſaid in the Comedy, *Quid verba audiam cum facta videam?* ſo may I ſay to you, *Quid verba audiam cum facta non videam?* To what purpoſe ſhould you give us Charitable Words, which preſently you retract again, by denying us your Charitable Actions. And as theſe things you muſt do, if you will ſtand to and make good this pretended Charity, ſo muſt I tell you again and again, that one thing

you.

you must not doe; I mean you must not affright poor People out of their Religion, with telling them, that *by the Confession of both sides, your way is safe, but in your judgment, ours undoubtedly damnable.* Seeing neither you deny Salvation to *Protestants Dying with repentance,* nor we promise it to you, *if ye Die without it.* For to deal plainly with you, I know no *Protestant* that hath any other hope of your Salvation, but upon these grounds, that *unaffected ignorance* may excuse you, or *true repentance* obtain pardon for you; neither do the heavy censures which *Protestants* (you say) pass upon your Errors, any way hinder but they may hope as well of you, upon repentance, as I do. For the *fierce Doctrine,* which, God knows who, teaches, that *Christ for many Ages before* Luther *had no visible Church upon Earth*; will be mild enough, if you conceive them to mean (as perhaps they do) by *no visible Church, none pure and free from corruptions,* which in your judgment is all one with no Church. But the truth is the *corruption* of the Church, and the *destruction* of it, is not all one. For if a particular man or Church may (as you confess they may) hold some particular Errors, and yet be a member of the Church Universal: why may not the Church hold some Universal Error, and yet be still the Church? especially, seeing you say, it is nothing but *opposing the Doctrine of the Church, that makes an Error damnable,* and it is impossible that the Church should oppose the Church, I mean that the present Church should oppose it self. And then for the *English Protestants,* though they censure your Errors deeply, yet, by your favour, with their deepest censures it may well consist that *invincible ignorance* may excuse you from damnation for them. For you your self confess *that ignorance may excuse Errors, even in Fundamental Articles of Faith: so that a man so erring shall not offend at all in such his ignorance or Error*; they are your own words. p. 19. And again with their heaviest censures it may well consist, that your Errors though in themselves damanble, yet may prove *not damning* to you, if you Die with true repentance, for all your sins known and unknown.

5. Thus

5. Thus much Charity therefore, if you ſtand to what you have ſaid, is interchangeably granted by each Side to the other, that Neither Religion is ſo fatally *deſtructive, but that by ignorance or repentance Salvation may be had on both Sides:* though with a difference that keeps *Papiſts* ſtill on the more uncharitable Side. For whereas we conceive a lower degree of repentance (that which they call *Attrition)* if it be true, and effectual, and convert the Heart of the Penitent, will ſerve in them: They pretend (even this *Author* which is moſt charitable towards us,) that *without Contrition* there is no hope for us: But though *Proteſtants* may not obtain this purchaſe at ſo eaſie a rate as *Papiſts*, yet (even *Papiſts* being Judges) they may obtain it; and though there is no entrance for them but at the only door of *Contrition*, yet they may enter, Heaven is not inacceſſible to them. Their Errors are no ſuch impenetrable Iſtmus's between them and Salvation, but that *Contrition* may make a way through them. All their Schiſm and Hereſie is no ſuch fatal Poyſon, but that if a man joyn with it the Antidote of a general repentance, he may Die in it, and live for ever. Thus much then being acknowledged, I appeal to any indifferent reader, whether *C. M.* be not by this *Hyperaſpiſt* forſaken in the plain Field, and the point in queſtion granted to *D. Potter*, viz. *That Proteſtancy even without a particular repentance, is not deſtructive of Salvation*; ſo that all the Controverſie remaining now, is, not ſimply whether *Proteſtancy unrepented deſtroys Salvation?* as it was at firſt propoſed, but *Whether Proteſtancy in it ſelf* (that is *abſtracting from ignorance and contrition*) *deſtroys Salvation?* So that as a fooliſh Fellow who gave a Knight the Lie, deſiring withal leave of him to ſet his Knighthood aſide, was anſwered by him, that he would not ſuffer any thing to be ſet aſide that belonged unto him: So might we juſtly take it amiſs, that conceiving as you do Ignorance and Repentance ſuch neceſſary things for us, you are not more willing to conſider us with them, than without them. For my part ſuch is my Charity to you, that conſidering what great neceſſity *You* have, as much as any

Chriſtian

Christian Society in the World, that these Sanctuaries of *Ignorance* and *Repentance* should always stand open, I can very hardly persuade my self so much as in my most secret consideration to devest you of these so needful qualifications: But whensoever your Errors, superstitions and impieties come into my mind, (and besides the general bonds of humanity and Christianity, my own particular Obligations to many of you, such and so great, that you cannot perish without a part of my self,) my only comfort is amidst these Agonies, that the Doctrine and Practice too of Repentance, is yet remaining in your Church: And that though you put on a Face of confidence of your Innocence in point of Doctrine, yet you will be glad to stand in the Eye of Mercy as well as your fellows, and not be so stout, as to refuse either Gods pardon or the Kings.

6. But for the present, Protestancy is called to the Barr, and though not sentenced by you to Death without Mercy, yet arraigned of so much natural malignity (if not corrected by *Ignorance* or *Contrition*) as to be *in it self destructive of Salvation*. Which controversie I am content to dispute with you; only remembring you, that the adding of this limitation [*in it self*] hath made this a new Question, and that this is not the conclusion for which you were charged with *want of Charity*.

7. Ad 7. and 8. §.] C. M. *Now this is our gradation of reasons. Almighty God having ordained mankind to a supernatural end of Eternal Felicity, hath in his providence setled competent Means*, &c.

CHIL. In your gradation I shall rise so far with you as to grant, *that Christ founded a visible Church, stored with all helps necessary to Salvation, particularly with sufficient means to beget and conserve Faith, to maintain Unity, and compose Schisms, to discover and condemn Heresies, and to determine all controversies in Religion*, which were necessary to be determined. For all these purposes, he gave at the beginning (as we may see in the Ep. to the *Ephesians*) *Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors, and Doctors*: who by word of mouth taught their contemporaries, and by writings

tings (wrote indeed by some, but approved by all of them) taught their Christian posterity to the Worlds End, how all these ends, and that which is the End of all these ends, Salvation, is to be atchieved. And these means the Providence of God hath still preserved, and so preserved, that they are sufficient for all these intents. I say *sufficient*, though, through the Malice of Men, not always *effectual*, for that the same means may be sufficient for the compassing an end, and not effectual, you must not deny, who hold that *God gives all men sufficient means of Salvation, and yet that all are not saved.* I said also, sufficient to determine all controversies, which *were necessary to be determined.* For if some controversies may for many Ages be undetermined, and yet in the mean while men be saved; why should, or how can the Churches being furnished with effectual means to determine *all* Controversies in Religion be necessary to Salvation, the end it self, to which these means are ordained being as experience shews not necessary? Plain sense will teach every man, that the necessity of the means must always be measured by, and can never exceed the necessity of the end. As if eating be necessary, only that I may live, then certainly if I have no necessity to live, I have no necessity to eat. If I have no need to be at *London*, I have no need of a Horse to carry me thither. If I have no need to Fly, I have no need of Wings. Answer me then I pray directly, and Categorically, Is it necessary that all Controversies in Religion should be determined, or is it not? If it be, why is the question of *Predetermination*, of the *immaculate conception*, of the *Popes indirect power in temporalties*, so long undetermined? if not, what is it but Hypocrisie to pretend such great necessity of such effectual means, for the atchieving that end, which is it self not necessary. Christians therefore have and shall have *means sufficient* (though not always effectual) *to determine* not all *controversies* but *all necessary to be determined.* I proceed on farther with you, and grant that this means to decide controversies in Faith and Religion, must be indued with an Universal Infallibility in whatsoever it pro-

poundeth for a Divine truth. For if it may be false in any one thing of this nature, in any thing which God requires men to believe, we can yield unto it but a wavering and fearful assent in any thing. These grounds therefore I grant very readily, and give you free leave to make your best advantage of them. And yet, to deal truly, I do not perceive how from the denial of any of them it would follow that Faith is Opinion: or from the granting them, that it is not so. But for my part, whatsoever clamour you have raised against me, I think no otherwise of the Nature of Faith, I mean *Historical Faith*, than generally both *Protestants* and *Papists* do; for I conceive it *an assent to Divine Revelations upon the Authority of the revealer.* Which though in many things it differ from Opinion, (as commonly the Word *Opinion* is understood) yet in some things, I doubt not but you will confess, that it agrees with it. As first, that as Opinion is an Assent, so is Faith also. Secondly, that as Opinion, so Faith is always built upon less evidence than that of Sence or Science. Which assertion you not only grant but mainly contend for in your *sixth Ch.* Thirdly and lastly, that as Opinion, so Faith admits degrees; and that as there may be a strong and weak Opinion, so there may be a strong and weak Faith. These things if you will grant (as sure if you be in your right mind you will not deny any of them) I am well contented that this ill-sounding Word, *Opinion*, should be discarded, and that among the Intellectual habits you should seek out some other *Genus* for *Faith.* For I will never contend with any man about Words, who grants my meaning.

8. *But though the Essence of Faith exclude not all weakness and imperfection, yet may it be enquired, whether any certainty of Faith, under the highest degree may be sufficient to please God and attain Salvation.* Whereunto I answer, that though men are unreasonable, God requires not any thing but Reason. They will not be pleased without a down weight, but God is contented if the Scale be turned. They pretend, that Heavenly things cannot be seen to any purpose, but by the mid-day-light: But God will be satisfied,

ed, if we receive any degree of light which makes us leave the *Works of Darkness and walk as Children of the Light.* They exact a certainty of Faith above that of Sence or Science, God desires only that we believe the conclusion, as much as the premises deserve, that the strength of our Faith be equal or proportionable to the credibility of the Motives to it. Now though I have and ought to have an absolute certainty of this Thesis, *All which God reveals for truth is true,* being a proposition that may be demonstrated, or rather so evident to any one that understands it, that it needs it not; Yet of this Hypothesis, *That all the Articles of our Faith were revealed by God,* we cannot ordinarily have any rational and acquired certainty, more than moral, founded upon these considerations: First that the goodness of the precepts of Christianity, and the greatness of the promises of it, shews it, of all other Religions, most likely to come from the Fountain of goodness. And then that a constant, famous and very general Tradition, so credible, that no Wise Man doubts of any other, which hath but the Fortieth part of the credibility of this, such and so credible a Tradition, tells us, that God himself hath set his Hand and Seal to the Truth of this Doctrine, by doing great, and glorious, and frequent miracles in confirmation of it. Now our Faith is an assent to this conclusion, that *the Doctrine of Christianity is true,* which being deduced from the former *Thesis,* which is Metapyhsically certain, and from the former *Hypothesis,* whereof we can have but a Moral certainty, we cannot possibly by natural means be more certain of it than of the weaker of the premises; as a River will not rise higher than the Fountain from which it flows. For the conclusion always follows the worser part, if there be any worse: and must be Negative, Particular, Contingent, or but Morally certain, if any of the Propositions, from whence it is derived be so: Neither can we be certain of it in the highest degree, unless we be thus certain of all the principles whereon it is grounded. As a man cannot go or stand strongly, if either of his Legs be weak. Or as a building cannot be stable, if any one

of the necessary Pillars thereof be infirm and instable. Or as, If a message be brought me, from a man of absolute credit with me, but by a messenger that is not so, my confidence of the Truth of the Relation, cannot but be rebated and lessened, by my diffidence in the Relator.

9. Yet all this I say not as if I doubted, that the Spirit of God, being implored by devout and humble Prayer and sincere obedience, may, and will by degrees, advance his servants higher, and give them a certainty of adherence, beyond their certainty of evidence. But what God gives as a reward to believers, is one thing: and what he requires of all men, as their duty, is another: and what he will accept of out of grace and favour, is yet another. To those that believe and live according to their Faith, he gives by degrees the *Spirit of obsignation and confirmation*, which makes them know (though how they know not) what they did but believe: And to be as fully and resolutely assured of the Gospel of Christ, as those which heard it from Christ himself with their Ears, which saw it with their Eyes, which looked upon it, and whose hands handled the Word of Life. He requires of all, that their Faith should be (as I have said) proportionable to the motives and Reasons enforcing to it; he will accept of the weakest and lowest degree of Faith, if it be living and effectual unto true obedience. For he it is that *will not quench the smoaking Flax, nor break the bruised Reed.* He did not reject the Prayer of that distressed man that cried unto him, *Lord I believe, Lord help my unbelief.* He commands us to *receive them that are weak in Faith*, and thereby declares that he receives them. And as nothing avails with him, but Faith *wich worketh by love:* So any Faith, if it be but as a *grain of Mustard seed*, if it *work by love*, shall certainly avail with him and be accepted of him. Some experience makes me fear, that the Faith of considering and discoursing men, is like to be crackt with too much straining: And that being possessed with this *false* Principle, that it is in vain to believe the Gospel of Christ, with such a kind or degree of assent, as they yield to other matters of Tradition: And finding that their Faith of it,

is

is to them undiscernable, from the belief they give to the truth of other Stories; are in danger either not to believe at all, thinking not at all as good as to no purpose, or else, though indeed they do believe it, yet to think they do not, and to cast themselves into wretched agonies and perplexities, as fearing they have not that, without which it is impossible to please God and obtain Eternal happiness. Consideration of this advantage, which the Devil probably may make of this Phansie, made me willing to insist somewhat largely upon the Refutation of it.

10. I return now thither from whence I have digressed, and assure you, concerning the grounds afore-laid, which were, that there is a *Rule of Faith, whereby controversies may be decided, which are necessary to be decided,* and that *this rule is Universally infallible,* That notwithstanding any Opinion I hold, touching Faith, or any thing else, I may, and do believe them, as firmly as you pretend to do. And therefore you may build on, in Gods name, for by Gods help, I shall always embrace, whatsoever structure is naturally and rationally laid upon them, whatsoever conclusion may, to my understanding, be evidently deduced from them. You say, out of them it undeniably follows, *That of two disagreeing in matter of Faith, the one cannot be saved, but by Repentance or Ignorance.* I answer by distinction of those terms, *two dissenting in a matter of Faith.* For it may be either in a thing which is indeed a *matter of Faith,* in the strictest sense, that is, something, the Belief whereof God requires under pain of damnation: And so the conclusion is true, though the Consequence of it from your former premisses either is none at all, or so obscure, that I can hardly discern it. Or it may be as it oftens falls out concerning a thing which being indeed *no matter of Faith, is yet overvalued* by the Parties at variance, and esteemed to be so. And in this sense it is neither consequent nor true. The untruth of it I have already declared in my examination of your Preface. The inconsequence of it is of it self evident; for who ever heard of a wilder Collection than this ——

God

God hath provided means sufficient to decide all Controversies in Religion, necessary to be decided;
This means is Universally infallible,
Therefore of two, that differ in any thing which they esteem a matter of Faith, one cannot be saved.

He that can find any connection between these Propositions, I believe will be able to find good coherence between the Deaf Plantiff's Accusation, in the *Greek* Epigram, and the Deaf Defendants Answer, and the Deaf Judges Sentence: And to contrive them all into a formal Categorical Syllogism.

11. Indeed if the matter in agitation were plainly decided, by this infallible means of deciding Controversies, and the Parties in variance knew it to be so, and yet would stand out in their dissention; this were in one of them, direct opposition to the Testimony of God, and undoubtedly a damnable sin. But if you take the liberty to suppose what you please, you may very easily conclude what you list. For who is so foolish as to grant you these unreasonable Postulates, that every emergent Controversie of Faith, is plainly decided by the means of dicision which God hath appointed, and that of the Parties litigant, one is always such a convicted Recusant as you pretend! Certainly, if you say so, having no better warrant than you have, or can have for it, this is more proper and formal uncharitableness, than ever was charged upon you. Methinks, with much more Reason, and much more Charity, you might suppose, that many of these Controversies which are now disputed among Christians (all which profess themselves lovers of Christ, and truly desirous to know his Will and do it) are either *not decidable* by that means which God hath provided, and so not necessary to be decided: Or if they be, yet *not so plainly and evidently*, as to oblige all men to hold one way: or Lastly, if decidable, and evidently decided, yet you may hope that the erring part, by reason of some Vail before his Eyes, *some excusable ignorance or unavoidable prejudice*, does not see the Question to be decided against him, and so opposes not that which He doth

doth know to be the word of God, but only that which You know to be so, and which he might know, were he void of prejudice. Which is a fault I confess, but a fault which is incident even to good and honest men very often: and not of such a gigantick disposition as you make it, to fly directly upon God Almighty, and to give him the Lie to his Face.

12. Ad 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16. §.] In all this long discourse you only tell us what you will do, but do nothing, but reserve them to the Chapters following, and there they shall be examined. The Sum of all collected by your self, §. 16. is this.

That *the Infallible means of determining Controversies, is the Visible Church.*

That *the distinction of points Fundamental, and not Fundamental, maketh nothing to the present Question.*

That *to say the Creed containeth all Fundamentals, is neither pertinent nor true.*

That *whosoever persist in Division from the Communion and Faith of the* Roman *Church are guilty of Schism and Heresie.*

That *in regard of the Precept of Charity towards one self,* Protestants *are in state of Sin, while they remain divided from the* Roman *Church.*

To all these Assertions I will content my self for the present to oppose this one, That *not one of them all is true.* Only I may not omit to tell you, that if the first of them were as true as the *Pope* himself desires it should be, yet the Corollary which you deduce from it, would be utterly inconsequent, That *whosoever denys any point proposed by the Church, is injurious to Gods Divine Majesty, as if he could deceive, or be deceived.* For though your Church were indeed as *Infallible a Propounder of Divine Truths* as it pretends to be, yet if it appeared not to me to be so, I might very well believe God most true, and your Church most false. As though the Gospel of S. *Matthew* be the Word of God, yet if I neither knew it to be so, nor believed it, I might believe in God, and yet think that Gospel a Fable. Hereafter therefore I must entreat you to remember,

remember, that our being guilty of this impiety, depends not only upon your being, but upon our knowing that you are so. Neither must you argue thus, *The Church of* Rome *is the Infallible Propounder of Divine Verities, therefore he that opposes Her calls Gods Truth in Question:* But thus rather; The *Church of* Rome *is so, and* Protestants *know it to be so, therefore in opposing Her, they impute to God, that either he deceives them, or is deceived himself.* For as I may deny something which you upon your knowledg have affirmed, and yet never disparage your honesty, if I never knew that you affirmed it: So I may be undoubtedly certain of Gods Omniscience, and Veracity, and yet doubt of something which he hath revealed, provided I do not know, nor believe that he hath revealed it. So, that though your Church be the appointed witness of Gods Revelations; yet until you know, that we know she is so, you cannot without foul Calumny impute to us, That *we charge God blasphemously with deceiving, or being deceived.* You will say perhaps, That this is directly consequent from our Doctrine, That the *Church may Err,* which is directed by God in all Her proposals. True, if we knew it to be directed by him, otherwise not; much less if we believe, and know the contrary. But then if it were consequent from our Opinion, have you so little Charity as to say, that men are *justly chargeable with all the consequences of their Opinions.*; Such consequences, I mean, as they do not own but disclaim, and if there were a necessity of doing either, would much rather forsake their Opinion than embrace these Consequences? What Opinion is there that draws after it such a Train of *portentous Blasphemies,* as that of the *Dominicans,* by the judgment of the best Writers of your own *Order?* And will you say now that the *Dominicans* are justly chargeable with all these Blasphemies? If not, seeing our case (take it at the worst) is but the same, why should not your judgment of us be the same? I appeal to all those *Protestants* that have gone over to your Side; whether when they were most averse from it, they did ever deny or doubt of *Gods omniscience or veracity*; whe-

whether they did ever believe, or were taught, that *God did deceive them, or was deceived himſelf.* Nay, I provoke to you your ſelf, and deſire you to deal truly, and to tell Us whether you do in your Heart believe, that we do indeed not believe the Eternal Veracity of the Eternal Verity? And if you judge ſo ſtrangely of us, having no better ground for it, than you have or can have, we ſhall not need any farther proof of your uncharitableneſs towards us, this being the extremity of true uncharitableneſs. If not, then I hope having no other ground but this (which ſure is none at all) to pronounce us *damnable Hereticks*, you will ceaſe to do ſo; and hereafter (as, if your ground be true, you may do with more truth and Charity) Collect thus, *They only Err damnably, who oppoſe what they know God hath teſtified*, But Proteſtants *ſure do not oppoſe what they know God hath teſtified, at leaſt we cannot with Charity ſay they do, Therefore they either do not Err damnably, or with Charity we cannot ſay they do ſo.*

13. Ad 17. §.] *Proteſtants* (you ſay) *according to their own grounds muſt hold that of Perſons contrary in whatſoever point of belief one part only can be ſaved, therefore it is ſtrangely done of them to charge* Papiſts *with want of Charity for holding the ſame.* The conſequence I acknowledg, but wonder much what it ſhould be that lays upon *Proteſtants* any neceſſity to do ſo! You tell us it is their holding *Scripture the ſole Rule of Faith*: for this, you ſay, obligeth them to pronounce them damned, that oppoſe any leaſt point *delivered in Scripture.* This I grant, If they oppoſe it after ſufficient declaration, ſo that either they *know it to be contained in Scripture*, or have no juſt probable Reaſon, and which may move an honeſt man to doubt whether or no it be there contained. For to oppoſe in the firſt Caſe in a man that believes the Scripture to be the Word of God, is to give God the Lie. To oppoſe in the ſecond, is to be obſtinate againſt Reaſon, and therefore a ſin though not ſo great as the former. But then this is nothing to the purpoſe of the neceſſity of damning all thoſe that are of contrary belief; and that for theſe Reaſons. Firſt, becauſe the contrary belief may be touch-

ing a point not at all mentioned in Scripture; and such points, though indeed they be not *matters of Faith*, yet by men in variance are often over-valued and esteemed to be so. So that, though it were damnable to oppose any point contained in Scripture; yet Persons of a contrary belief (as *Victor* and *Polycrates*, S. *Cyprian*, and *Stephen*) might both be saved, because their contrary belief was not touching any point contained in Scripture. Secondly, because the contrary belief may be about the sense of some place of Scripture which is ambiguous, and with probability capable of diverse Senses; and in such Cases it is no marvel, and sure no Sin, if several men go several ways. Thirdly, because the contrary belief may be concerning points wherein Scripture may with so great probability be alledged on both sides, (which is a sure note of a point *not necessary*) that men of honest and upright Hearts, true lovers of God and of truth, such as desire, above all things, to know Gods Will and to do it, may, without any fault at all, some go one way, and some another, and some (and those as good men as either of the former) suspend their judgments, and expect some *Elias to solve doubts*, and reconcile repugnances. Now in all such Questions one side or other (which soever it is) holds that which indeed is opposite to the sense of the Scripture, which God intended; for it is impossible that God should intend Contradictions. But then this intended Sense is not so fully declared, but that they which oppose it may verily believe that they indeed maintain it, and have great shew of reason to induce them to believe so; and therefore are not to be damned, as men opposing that which they either know to be a truth delivered in Scripture, or have no probable Reason to believe the contrary; but rather in Charity to be acquitted and absolved, as men who endeavour to find the Truth, but fail of it through humane frailty.

This ground being laid, the Answer to your ensuing Interrogatories, which you conceive impossible, is very obvious and easie.

14. *To*

14. *To the first, Whether it be not in any man a grievous sin to deny any any one Truth contained in holy Writ?* I answer, Yes, if he knew it to be so, or have no probable Reason to doubt of it: otherwise not.

15. *To the second, Whether there be in such denial any distinction between Fundamental and not Fundamental sufficient to excuse from Heresie?* I answer, Yes, There is such a distinction. But the Reason is, because these points, either in themselves, or by accident, are *Fundamental*, which are *evidently contained in Scripture, to him that knows them to be so:* Those not Fundamental which are there-hence deducible but probably only, not evidently.

16. *To the third, Whether it be not impertinent to alledge the Creed as containing all Fundamental points of Faith, as if believing it alone we were at Liberty to deny all other Points of Scripture?* I answer, It was never alledged to any such purpose; but only as a sufficient, or rather more than a sufficient Summary of those points of Faith, which were of necessity to be believed actually and explicitely; and that only of such which were meerly and purely *Credenda*, and not *Agenda*.

17. *To the fourth*, drawn as a Corollary from the former, *Whether this be not to say, that of Persons contrary in belief, one part only can be saved?* I answer, By no means. For they may differ about points *not contained in Scripture*: They may differ about the *sense of some ambiguous Texts* of Scripture: They may differ about some Doctrines, for and against which Scriptures may be alledged with *so great probability*, as may justly excuse either Part from Heresie, and a self-condemning obstinacy. And therefore, though *D. Potter* do not take it ill, that you believe your selves may be saved in your Religion; yet notwithstanding all that hath yet been pretended to the contrary, he may justly condemn you, and that out of your own principles, of *uncharitable presumption*, for affirming as you do, that *no man can be saved out of it*.

CHAP. II.

The ANSWER to the Second CHAPTER.

Concerning the means, whereby the revealed Truths of God are conveyed to our underſtanding; and which muſt determine Controverſies in Faith and Religion.

C. M. *Of our eſtimation, reſpect and reverence to holy Scripture, even* Proteſtants *themſelves give Teſtimony, while they poſſeſs it from us, and take it upon the integrity of our cuſtody,* &c.

CHIL. Ad §. 1.] He that would Uſurp an abſolute Lordſhip and Tyranny over any People, need not put himſelf to the trouble and difficulty of abrogating and diſanulling the Laws, made to maintain the Common Liberty; for he may fruſtrate their intent, and compaſs his own deſign as well, if he can get the Power and Authority to interpret them as he pleaſes, and add to them what he pleaſes, and to have his interpretations and additions ſtand for Laws; if he can rule his People by his Laws, and his Laws by his Lawyers. So the *Church of* Rome, to eſtabliſh Her Tyranny over mens Conſciences, needed not either to aboliſh or corrupt the Holy Scriptures, the Pillars and Supporters of Chriſtian Liberty (which in regard of the numerous multitude of Copies diſperſed through all places, Tranſlated into almoſt all Languages, guarded with all ſollicitous care and induſtry, had been an impoſſible attempt;) But the more expedite way, and therefore more likely to be ſucceſsful, was to gain the opinion and eſteem of the *publick and authorized interpreter* of them, and the Authority of adding to them what Doctrine ſhe pleaſed under the Title of *Traditions* or *Definitions.* For by this means, ſhe might both ſerve her ſelf of all thoſe cauſes of Scripture, which might be drawn to caſt a favourable countenance upon Her ambitious pretences, which in caſe the Scripture had been aboliſhed, ſhe could not have done; and yet be ſecure enough of having

having either her Power limitted, or her corruptions and abuſes reformed by them; this being once ſetled in the minds of men, that *unwritten Doctrines, if propoſed by her, were to be received with equal reverence to thoſe that were written:* and that *the ſenſe of Scripture was not that which ſeemed to mens reaſon and underſtanding to be ſo, but that which the Church of* Rome *ſhould declare to be ſo, ſeemed it never ſo unreaſonable, and incongruous.* The matter being once thus ordered, and the holy Scriptures being made in effect not your Directors and Judges (no farther than you pleaſe) but your *Servants and Inſtruments,* always preſt and in readineſs to advance your deſigns, and diſabled wholly with minds ſo qualified to prejudice or impeach them; it is ſafe for you to put a Crown on their head, and a Reed in their Hands, and to bow before them, and cry, *Hail King of the* Jews! to pretend a great deal of *eſteem, and reſpect, and reverence* to them, as here you do. But to little purpoſe is verbal reverence without entire ſubmiſſion and ſincere obedience; and, as our Saviour ſaid of ſome, ſo the Scripture, could it ſpeak, I believe would ſay to you, Why *call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not that which I command you?* Caſt away the vain and arrogant pretence of *Infallibility,* which makes your Errors incurable. Leave Picturing God, and Worſhiping him by Pictures. *Teach not for Doctrine the Commandments of men.* Debar not the Laity of the Teſtament of Chriſt's Blood. Let your publick *Prayers,* and *Pſalms* and *Hymes* be in ſuch Language as is for the Edification of the Aſſiſtants. Take not from the Clergy that Liberty of Marriage which Chriſt hath left them. Do not impoſe upon men that *Humility of Worſhiping Angels* which S. *Paul* condemns. Teach no more proper Sacrifices of Chriſt but one. Acknowledge them *that Die in Chriſt to be bleſſed, and to reſt from their Labours.* Acknowledge the Sacrament after Conſecration, to be Bread and Wine, as well as Chriſts Body and Blood. Acknowledge the gift of continency without Marriage not to be given to all. Let not the Weapons of your Warfare be Carnal; ſuch as are Maſſacres, Treaſons, Perſecutions, and in a word all means either

either violent or fraudulent: Theſe and other things, which the Scripture commands you, do, and then we ſhall willingly give you ſuch Teſtimony as you deſerve; but till you do ſo, to talk of eſtimation, reſpect, and reverence to the Scripture, is nothing elſe but talk.

2. For neither is that true which you pretend, *That we poſſeſs the Scripture from you, or take it upon the integrity of your Cuſtody*, but upon *Univerſal Tradition*, of which you are but a little part. Neither, If it were true that *Proteſtants* acknowledged, *The integrity of it to have been guarded by your alone Cuſtody*, were this any argument of your reverence towards them. For firſt, you might preſerve them entire, not for want of Will, but of Power to corrupt them, *as it is a hard thing to Poyſon the Sea.* And then having prevailed ſo far with men, as either not to look at all into them, or but only through ſuch ſpectacles as you ſhould pleaſe to make for them, and to ſee nothing in them, though as clear as the Sun, if it any way made againſt you, you might keep them entire, without any thought or care to conform your Doctrine to them, or reform it by them (which were indeed to reverence the Scriptures) but out of a perſuaſion, that you could qualifie them well enough with your gloſſes and interpretations, and make them ſufficiently conformable to your preſent Doctrine, at leaſt, in their judgment, who were prepoſſeſſed with this perſuaſion, that *your Church was to judge of the ſenſe of Scripture, not to be judged by it.*

3. Whereas you ſay, *No cauſe imaginable could avert your will from giving the function of Supream and ſole judge to holy Writ, but that the thing is impoſſible, and that by this means controverſies are encreaſed and not ended.* What indifferent and unprejudiced man may not eaſily conceive another cauſe which (I do not ſay does, but certainly) may prevert your Wills, and avert your underſtandings from ſubmitting your Religion and Church to a *Tryal by Scripture.* I mean the great and apparent and unavoidable danger which by this means you would fall into, of loſing the Opinion which men have of your Infallibility, and conſequently your Power and Authority over mens Conſciences,

ſciences, and all that depends upon it; ſo that though *Diana of the Epheſians* be cryed up, yet it may be feared that with a great many among you (though I cenſure or judge no man) the other cauſe which wrought upon *Demetrius* and the *Craftsmen*, may have with you alſo the more effectual, though more ſecret influence: and that is, that *by this craft we have our living*; by this craft, I mean of keeping your Proſelytes from an indifferent Tryal of your Religion by Scripture, and making them yield up and captivate their judgment unto yours.

As for the impoſſibility of Scriptures being the ſole Judge of Controverſies, that is, *the ſole rule for man to judge them by* (for we mean nothing elſe) you only affirm it without proof, as if the thing were evident of it ſelf. And therefore I, conceiving the contrary to be more evident, might well content my ſelf to deny it without refutation. Yet I cannot but deſire you to tell me, If Scripture cannot be the Judge of any Controverſie, how ſhall that touching the *Church and the Notes of it* be determined? And if it be the ſole Judge of this one, why may it not of others? Why not of All? Thoſe only excepted wherein the Scripture it ſelf is the ſubject of the Queſtion, which cannot be determined but by natural reaſon, the only Principle, beſide Scripture, which is common to Chriſtians.

4. Then for the Imputation of *increaſing contentions and not ending them*, Scripture is innocent of it; as alſo this Opinion; *That Controverſies are to be decided by Scripture.* For if men did really and ſincerely ſubmit their judgments to Scripture, and that only, and would require no more of any man but to do ſo, it were impoſſible but that all Controverſies, touching things neceſſary and very profitable ſhould be ended: and if others were continued or increaſed, it were no matter.

5. In the next Words we have direct *Boyes-play*; a thing given with one hand and taken away with the other; an acknowledgment made in one line, and retracted in the next. *We acknowledge* (ſay you) *Scripture to be a perfect rule, for as much as a writing can be a Rule, only*

only we deny that it excludes unwritten Tradition. As if you ſhould have ſaid, we acknowledge it to be as perfect a Rule as a writing can be; only we deny it to be as perfect a Rule as a writing may be. Either therefore you muſt revoke your acknowledgment, or retract your retractation of it; for both cannot poſſibly ſtand together. For if you will ſtand to what you have granted, That *Scripture is as perfect a Rule of Faith as a Writing can be:* you muſt then grant it both ſo *Compleat*, that it needs no addition, and ſo *evident*, that it needs no interpretation: For both theſe properties are requiſite to a *perfect rule*; and a Writing is capable of both theſe properties.

6. That both theſe Properties are requiſite to a *perfect rule*, it is apparent: Becauſe that is not perfect in any kind which wants ſome parts belonging to its integrity: As he is not a perfect man that wants any part appertaining to the Integrity of a Man; and therefore that which wants any acceſſion to make it a perfect rule, of its ſelf is not a perfect Rule. And then, the end of a *rule* is to regulate and direct. Now every inſtrument is more or leſs perfect in its kind, as it is more or leſs fit to attain the end for which it is ordained: But nothing obſcure or unevident while it is ſo, is fit to regulate and direct them to whom it is ſo: Therefore it is requiſite alſo to a *rule* (ſo far as it is a Rule) to be evident; otherwiſe indeed it is no *rule*, becauſe it cannot ſerve for direction. I conclude therefore, that both theſe properties are required to a perfect Rule: both to be ſo compleat as to need no Addition; and to be ſo evident as to need no Interpretation.

7. Now that a Writing is capable of both theſe perfections, it is ſo plain, that I am even aſhamed to prove it. For he that denies it muſt ſay, That *ſomething may be ſpoken which cannot be written.* For if ſuch a compleat and evident rule of Faith may be delivered by word of mouth, as you pretend it may, and is; and whatſoever is delivered by word of mouth may alſo be written; then ſuch a compleat and evident rule of Faith may alſo be written. If you will have more light added to the Sun, anſwer me then to theſe Queſtions. Whether your Church can ſet down in writing

ting all theſe, which ſhe pretends to be Divine unwritten Traditions, and add them to the verities already written? And whether ſhe can ſet us down ſuch interpretations of all obſcurities in the Faith as ſhall need no farther interpretations? If ſhe cannot, then ſhe hath not that power which you pretend ſhe hath, of being an *Infallible Teacher of all Divine verities*, and an infallible interpreter of obſcurities in the Faith: for ſhe cannot teach us all Divine verities, if ſhe cannot write them down; neither is that an interpretation which needs again to be interpreted: If ſhe can; Let her do it, and then we ſhall have a writing, not only capable of, but, actually endowed with both theſe perfections, of being both ſo compleat as to need no Addition, and ſo evident as to need no Interpretation. Laſtly, whatſoever your Church can do or not do, no man can without Blaſphemy deny, that *Chriſt Jeſus*, if he had pleaſed, could have writ us a rule of Faith ſo plain and perfect, as that it ſhould have wanted neither any part to make up its integrity, nor any clearneſs to make it ſufficiently intelligible: And if Chriſt could have done this, then the thing might have been done; a writing there might have been indowed with both theſe properties. Thus therefore I conclude, a writing may be ſo perfect a Rule, as to need neither Addition nor Interpretation; But the *Scripture you acknowledge a perfect Rule for as much as a writing can be a Rule*, therefore it needs neither Addition nor Interpretation.

8. You will ſay, *that though a writing be never ſo perfect a Rule of Faith, yet it muſt be beholden to Tradition to give it this Teſtimony, that it is a Rule of Faith, and the Word of God.* I anſwer: Firſt, there is no abſolute neceſſity of this. For God might, if he thought good, give it the atteſtation of perpetual Miracles. Secondly, that it is one thing to be a perfect Rule of Faith, another to be proved ſo unto us. And thus though a writing could not be proved to us to be a perfect rule of Faith, by its own ſaying ſo, for nothing is proved true by being ſaid or written in a Book, but only by Tradition which is a thing credible of it ſelf; yet it may be ſo in it ſelf, and contain

all the material Objects, all the particular Articles of our Faith, without any dependance upon Tradition; even this alſo not excepted, that *this Writing doth contain the rule of Faith.* Now when *Proteſtants* affirm againſt *Papiſts*, that *Scripture is a perfect rule of Faith*, their meaning is not, that by Scripture all things abſolutely may be proved, which are to be believed: For it can never be proved by Scripture to a gainſayer, that there is a God, or that the Book called Scripture is the Word of God; For he that will deny theſe Aſſertions when they are ſpoken, will believe them never a whit the more becauſe you can ſhew them written: But their meaning is, that the Scripture, to them which preſuppoſe it Divine, and a Rule of Faith, as *Papiſts* and *Proteſtants* do, contains all the material Objects of Faith; is a compleat and Total, and not only an imperfect and a partial Rule.

9. *But every Book and Chapter, and Text of Scripture is Infallible and wants no due perfection, and yet excludes not the Addition of other Book, of Scripture; Therefore the perfection of the whole Scripture excludes not the Addition of unwritten Tradition.* I anſwer; Every Text of Scripture though it have the perfection belonging to a Text of Scripture, yet it hath not the perfection requiſite to a *perfect Rule of Faith*; and that only is the perfection which is the ſubject of our diſcourſe. So that this is to abuſe your Reader with the ambiguity of the word *Perfect.* In effect, as if you ſhould ſay, a Text of Scripture may be a perfect Text, though there be others beſide it; therefore the whole Scripture may be a perfect Rule of Faith, though there be other parts of this Rule, beſides the Scripture, and though the Scripture be but a part of it.

10. The next Argument to the ſame purpoſe is, for Sophiſtry, Coſin German to the former. *When the firſt Books of Scripture were written, they did not exclude unwritten Tradition: Therefore now alſo, that all the Books of Scripture are written, Traditions are not excluded.* The ſenſe of which Argument (if it have any) muſt be this. When only a part of the Scripture was written, then a part of the Divine Doctrine was unwritten; Therefore now when

when all the Scripture is written, yet ſome part of the Divine Doctrine is yet unwritten. If you ſay, your concluſion is not that it is ſo, but without diſparagement to Scripture, may be ſo: without diſparagement to the truth of Scripture, I grant it; but without diſparagement to the Scriptures being a *perfect Rule*, I deny it. And now the Queſtion is not of the Truth, but the perfection of it; which are very different things, though you would fain confound them. For Scripture might very well be all true, though it contain not all neceſſary Divine Truth. But unleſs it do ſo, it cannot be a *perfect Rule of Faith*; for that which wants any thing is not perfect. For I hope you do not imagine, that we conceive any Antipathy between Gods Word Written and unwritten, but that both might very well ſtand together. All that we ſay is this, that we have reaſon to believe that God *de Facto*, hath ordered the matter ſo, that all the Goſpel of Chriſt, the whole Covenant between God and Man, is now Written. Whereas if he had pleaſed, he might ſo have diſpoſed it, that part might have been written, and part unwritten: but then he would have taken order, to whom we ſhould have had recourſe, for that part of it which was not written; which ſeeing he hath not done (as the Progreſs ſhall demonſtrate) it is evident he hath left no part of it unwritten. We know no man therefore that ſays, It were any injury to the written Word to be joyned with the unwritten, if there were any wherewith it might be joyned; but that we deny. The fidelity of a Keeper may very well conſiſt with the Authority of the thing committed to his Cuſtody. But we know no one Society of Chriſtians that is ſuch a faithful Keeper as you pretend. The Scripture it ſelf was not kept ſo faithfully by you, but that you ſuffered infinite variety of Readings to creep into it; all which could not poſſibly be Divine, and yet, in ſeveral parts of your Church, all of them, until the laſt Age, were ſo eſteemed. The interpretations of obſcure places of Scripture, which without Queſtion, the Apoſtles taught the Primitive Chriſtians are wholly loſt; there remains no certain-

ty ſcarce of any one. Thoſe *Worlds of Miracles*, which our Saviour did, which were not written, for want of writing are vaniſhed out of the memory of men. And many profitable things which the Apoſtles taught and writ not, as that which S. *Paul* glances at, in his *ſecond Epiſtle to the* Theſalon. of the *cauſe of the hindrance of the coming of Antichriſt*, are wholly loſt and extinguiſhed. So unfaithful or negligent hath been this keeper of Divine verities; whoſe eyes, like the Keepers of *Iſrael* (you ſay) have *never Slumbred nor Slept*. Laſtly, we deny not but a Judge and a Law might well ſtand together, but we deny that there is any ſuch Judge of Gods appointment. Had he intended any ſuch Judge, he would have named him, leſt otherwiſe (as now it is) our *Judge of Controverſies* ſhould be our greateſt Controverſie.

11. Ad 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. §.] In your ſecond Paragraph, you ſum up thoſe arguments wherewith you intend to prove, that *Scripture alone cannot be Judge in Controverſies*. Wherein I profeſs unto you before hand, that you will fight without an Adverſary. For though *Proteſtants*, being warranted by ſome of the Fathers, have called Scripture the *Judge of Controverſies*; and you in ſaying here, That Scripture *alone* cannot be Judge, imply that it may be called in ſome ſenſe a Judge, though not alone: Yet to ſpeak properly (as men ſhould ſpeak when they write of Controverſies in Religion) the Scripture is not a Judge of Controverſies, but *a Rule only and the only Rule for Chriſtians to judge them by*. Every man is to Judge for himſelf with the *Judgment of Diſcretion*, and to chooſe either his Religion firſt, and then his Church, as we ſay: or as you, his Church firſt, and then his Religion. But by the conſent of both ſides, every man is to judge and chooſe: and the Rule whereby he is to guide his choice, if he be a natural man, is Reaſon, if he be already a Chriſtian, Scripture, which we ſay is the Rule to judge Controverſies by. Yet not all ſimply, but all the Controverſies of Chriſtians, of thoſe, that are already agreed upon This firſt Principle that, *the Scripture is the Word of God*. But that there is any man, or any company of men appointed

ed to be judge for all men, that we deny, and that I believe you will never prove. The very truth is, we ſay no more in this matter, than evidence of Truth hath made you confeſs in plain terms in the beginning of this chap. *viz.* That *Scripture is a perfect Rule of Faith, for as much as a writing can be a Rule.* So that all your reaſons whereby you labour to dethrone the Scripture from this office of *Judging*, we might let paſs as impertinent to the concluſion which we maintain, and you have already granted; yet out of courteſie we will conſider them.

12. Your firſt is this; *a Judge muſt be a perſon fit to end Controverſies, but the Scripture is not a perſon, nor fit to end Controverſies, no more than the Law would be without the Judges, therefore though it may be a Rule it cannot be a Judge.* Which concluſion I have already granted. Only my requeſt is, that you will permit Scripture to have the properties of a Rule, that is, to be fit to direct every one that will make the beſt uſe of it, to that end for which it was ordained. And that is as much as we need deſire. For as if I were to go a Journey and had a guide which could not Err, I needed not to know my way: ſo on the other ſide, if I know my way or have a plain rule to know it by, I ſhall need no guide. Grant therefore Scripture to be ſuch a Rule, and it will quickly take away all neceſſity of having an Infallible guide. But *without a living Judge it will be no fitter* (you ſay) *to end Controverſies, than the Law alone to end Suits.* I anſwer, if the Law were plain and perfect, and men honeſt and deſirous to underſtand aright, and obey it, he that ſays it were not fit to end Controverſies, muſt either want underſtanding himſelf, or think the World wants it. Now the Scripture, we pretend, *in things neceſſary is plain and perfect*, and men, we ſay, are obliged, under pain of Damnation, to ſeek the true ſenſe of it, and not to wreſt it to their preconceived Phanſies. Such a Law therefore to ſuch men cannot but be very fit to end all Controverſies, neceſſary to be ended. For others that are not ſo, they will end when the World ends, and that is time enough.

13. Your

13. Your next encounter is with them, who acknowledging the Scripture a Rule only and not a Judge, make the Holy Ghoſt, ſpeaking in Scripture, the judge of Controverſies. Which you diſprove by ſaying, *That the Holy Ghoſt ſpeaking only in Scripture is no more intelligible to us, than the Scripture in which he ſpeaks.* But by this reaſon neither the *Pope*, nor a Council can be a Judge neither. For firſt, denying the Scriptures, the writings of the Holy Ghoſt, to be Judges, you will not I hope offer to pretend, that their decrees, the writings of men are more capable of this function : the ſame exceptions at leaſt, if not more, and greater lying againſt them as do againſt Scripture. And then what you Object againſt the Holy Ghoſt, ſpeaking in Scripture, to exclude him from this office, The ſame I return upon them and their decrees, to debar them from it ; that they ſpeaking unto us only in their decrees, are no more intelligible than the decrees in which they ſpeak. And therefore if the Holy Ghoſt ſpeaking in Scripture may not be a judge for this reaſon ; neither may they, ſpeaking in their decrees, be Judges for the ſame Reaſon. *If the* Popes *decrees* (you will ſay) *be obſcure , he can explain himſelf , and ſo the Scripture cannot.* But the Holy Ghoſt, that ſpeaks in Scripture, can do ſo, if he pleaſe, and when he is pleaſed will do ſo. In the mean time it will be fit for you to wait his leiſure, and to be content, that thoſe things of Scripture which are plain ſhould be ſo, and thoſe which are obſcure ſhould remain obſcure, until he pleaſe to declare them. Beſides he can (which you cannot warrant me of the *Pope* or a Coucil) ſpeak at firſt ſo plainly, that his Words ſhall need no farther explanation ; and ſo in things neceſſary we believe he has done. And if you ſay, *the Decrees of Councils touching Controverſies, though they be not the Judge, yet they are the Judges Sentence :* So, I ſay, the Scripture, though not the Judge, is the Sentence of the Judge. When therefore you conclude, *That to ſay a Judge is neceſſary for deciding Controverſies, about the meaning of Scripture, is as much as to ſay, he is neceſſary to decide what the Holy Ghoſt ſpeaks in Scripture :*

ture : This I grant is true, but I may not grant that a Judge (ſuch a one as we diſpute of) is neceſſary either to do the one, or the other. For if the Scripture (as it is in things neceſſary) be plain, why ſhould it be more neceſſary to have a judge to interpret them in plain places, than to have a judge to interpret the meaning of a Councils decrees, and others to interpret their Interpretations, and others to interpret theirs, and ſo on for ever? And where they are not plain, there if we, uſing diligence to find the truth, do yet miſs of it and fall into Error, there is no danger in it. They that Err, and they that do not Err may both be ſaved. So that thoſe places which contain things neceſſary, and wherein Error were dangerous, need no Infallible interpreter becauſe they are plain : and thoſe that are obſcure need none becauſe they contain not things neceſſary, neither is Error in them dangerous.

The Law-maker ſpeaking in the Law, I grant it, *is no more eaſily underſtood than the Law it ſelf,* for his Speech is nothing elſe but the Law : I grant it *very neceſſary, that beſides the Law-maker ſpeaking in the Law, there ſhould be other Judges to determine Civil and Criminal Controverſies, and to give every man that Juſtice which the Law allows him.* But your Argument drawn from hence to ſhew a neceſſity of a viſible Judge in Controverſies of Religion I ſay is Sophiſtical : and that for many Reaſons.

14. Firſt, Becauſe the variety of Civil caſes is infinite, and therefore there cannot be poſſibly Laws enough provided for the determination of them : and therefore there muſt be a Judge to ſupply out of the Principles of Reaſon the interpretation of the Law, where it is defective. But the Scripture (we ſay) is a perfect Rule of Faith, and therefore needs no ſupply of the defects of it.

15. Secondly, To execute the Letter of the Law, according to rigour, would be many times unjuſt, and therefore there is need of a Judge to moderate it; whereof in Religion there is no uſe at all.

16. Thirdly, In Civil and Criminal cauſes the parties have for the moſt part ſo much intereſt, and very often ſo little honeſty, that they will not ſubmit to a Law though never

never ſo plain, if it be againſt them; or will not ſee it to be againſt them, though it be ſo never ſo plainly: whereas if men were honeſt, and the Law were plain and extended to all caſes, there would be little need of Judges. Now in matters of Religion, when the Queſtion is, whether every man be a fit Judge and chooſer for himſelf, we ſuppoſe men honeſt, and ſuch as underſtand the difference between a Moment and Eternity. And ſuch men, we conceive, will think it highly concerns them to be of the true Religion, but nothing at all that this or that Religion ſhould be the true. And then we ſuppoſe that all the neceſſary points of Religion are plain and eaſie, and conſequently every man in this cauſe to be a competent Judge for himſelf; becauſe it concerns himſelf to judge right as much as Eternal happineſs is worth. And if through his own default he judge amiſs he alone ſhall ſuffer for it.

17. Fourthly, in Civil Controverſies we are obliged only to external paſſive obedience, and not to an internal and active. We are bound to obey the Sentence of the Judge, or not to reſiſt it, but not always to believe it juſt. But in matters of Religion, ſuch a Judge is required whom we ſhould be obliged to believe, to have judged right. So that in Civil Controverſies every honeſt underſtanding man is fit to be a Judge; But in Religion none but he that is infallible.

18. Fifthly, in Civil Cauſes there is means and power, when the Judge has decreed, to compel men to obey his Sentence: otherwiſe, I believe, Laws alone, would be to as much purpoſe, for the ending of differences, as Laws and Judges both. But all the Power in the World is neither fit to convince, nor able to compel a mans Conſcience to conſent to any thing. Worldly terror may prevail ſo far as to make men profeſs a Religion which they believe not, (ſuch men I mean, who know not that there is a Heaven provided for Martyrs, and a Hell for thoſe that diſſemble ſuch truths as are neceſſary to be profeſſed:) But to force, either any man to believe what he believes not, or any honeſt man to diſſemble what he does believe

(if

(if God commands him to profeſs it,) or to profeſs what he does not believe, all the Powers in the World are too weak, with all the Powers of Hell, to aſſiſt them.

19. Sixthly, in Civil Controverſies the caſe cannot be ſo put, but there may be a Judge to end it, who is not a party: In Controverſies of Religion, it is in a manner impoſſible to be avoided but the Judge muſt be a party. For this muſt be the firſt, whether he be a Judge or no, and in that he muſt be a party. Sure I am, the *Pope*, in the Controverſies of our time, is a chief party; for it highly concerns him, even as much as his Popedom is worth, not to yield any one point of his Religion to be Erroneous. And he is a man ſubject to like paſſions with other men. And therefore we may juſtly decline his Sentence, for fear temporal reſpects ſhould either blind his judgment, or make him pronounce againſt it.

20. Seventhly, in Civil Controverſies, it is impoſſible *Titius* ſhould hold the land in queſtion and *Sempronius* too: and therefore either the Plantiff muſt injure the Defendant, by diſquieting his poſſeſſion, or the Defendant wrong the Plantiff by keeping his right from him. But in Controverſies of Religion the Caſe is otherwiſe. I may hold my Opinion and do you no wrong, and you yours and do me none. Nay we may both of us hold our Opinion, and yet do our ſelves no harm; provided, the difference be not touching any thing neceſſary to Salvation, and that we love truth ſo well, as to be diligent to inform our Conſcience, and conſtant in following it.

21. Eightly, For the ending of Civil Controverſies, who does not ſee it is abſolutely neceſſary, that not only Judges ſhould be appointed, but that it ſhould be known and unqueſtioned who they are? Thus all the Judges of our Land are known men, known to be Judges, and no man can doubt or queſtion, but theſe are the Men. Otherwiſe if it were a diſputable thing, who were theſe Judges, and they had no certain warrant for their Authority, but only ſome Topical congruities, would not any man ſay ſuch Judges, in all likelihood, would rather multiply Controverſies, then end them?

22. Ninthly, and laſtly, For the deciding of Civil Controverſies men may appoint themſelves a judge. But in matters of Religion, this office may be given to none but whom God hath deſigned for it: who doth not always give us thoſe things which we conceive moſt expedient for our ſelves.

23. So likewiſe if our Saviour, the King of Heaven, had intended that all Controverſies in Religion ſhould be by ſome Viſible Judge finally determined, who can doubt, but in plain terms he would have expreſſed himſelf about this matter? He would have ſaid plainly. *The Biſhop of* Rome *I have appointed to decide all emergent Controverſies.* For that our Saviour deſigned the *Biſhop of Rome* to this Office, and yet would not ſay ſo, nor cauſe it to be written—*ad Rei memoriam*—— by any of the *Evangeliſts* or *Apoſtles*, ſo much as once; but leave it to be drawn out of uncertain Principles, by thirteen or fourteen more uncertain conſequences, He that can believe it, let him. All theſe Reaſons, I hope, will convince you, that though we have, and have great neceſſity of, Judges in Civil and Criminal cauſes: yet you may not conclude from thence, that there is any publick authorized Judge to determine Controverſies in Religion, nor any neceſſity there ſhould be any.

24. *But the Scripture ſtands in need of ſome watchful and unerring eye to guard it, by means of whoſe aſſured vigilancy we may undoubtedly receive it ſincere and pure.* Very true, but this is no other than the watchful Eye of Divine providence: the goodneſs whereof will never ſuffer, that the Scriptures ſhould be depraved and corrupted, but that in them ſhould be always extant a conſpicuous and plain way to Eternal happineſs. Neither can any thing be more palpably unconſiſtent with his goodneſs, than to ſuffer Scripture to be undiſcernably corrupted in any matter of moment, and yet to exact of men the belief of thoſe verities, which without their fault, or knowledge, or poſſibility of prevention, were defaced out of them. So that God requiring of men to believe Scripture in its purity, ingages himſelf to ſee it preſerved in ſufficient purity, and you need not fear but he will ſatisfie his ingagement.

You

You ſay, *we can have no aſſurance of this but your Churches Vigilancy.* But if we had no other we were in a hard caſe; for who could then aſſure us that your Church has been ſo vigilant, as to guard Scripture from any the leaſt alteration? There being various Lections in the ancient Copies of your Bibles, what ſecurity can your new raiſed *Office of Aſſurance* give us, that, that reading is true which you now receive, and that falſe which you reject? Certainly they that anciently received and made uſe of theſe divers Copies, were not all guarded by the Churches vigilancy from having their Scripture altered from the purity of the Original in many places. For of different readings, it is not in nature impoſſible that all ſhould be falſe, but more than one cannot poſſibly be true. Yet the want of ſuch a protection was no hindrance to their Salvation, and why then ſhall the having of it be neceſſary for ours? But then this Vigilancy of your Church, what means have we to be aſcertain'd of it? Firſt, the thing is not evident of it ſelf; which is evident, becauſe many do not believe it. Neither can any thing be pretended to give evidence to it, but only ſome places of Scripture; of whoſe incorruption more than any other what is it that can ſecure me? If you ſay the Churches vigilancy, you are in a Circle, proving the Scriptures uncorrupted by the Churches vigilancy, and the Churches vigilancy by the incorruption of ſome places of Scripture, and again the incorruption of thoſe places by the Churches vigilancy. If you name any other means, than that means which ſecures me of the Scriptures incorruption in thoſe places, will alſo ſerve to aſſure me of the ſame in other places. For my part, abſtracting from Divine Providence, which will never ſuffer the way to Heaven to be blocked up or made inviſible, I know no other means (I mean no other natural and rational means) to be aſſured hereof, than I have that any other Book is uncorrupted. For though I have a greater degree of rational and humane Aſſurance of that than this, in regard of divers conſiderations which make it more credible, *That the Scripture hath been preſerved from any material alteration*; yet my aſſurance of

both is of the ſame kind and condition, both Moral aſſurances, and neither Phyſical or Mathematical.

25. To the next argument the Reply is obvious; *That though we do not believe the Books of Scripture to be Canonical becauſe they ſay ſo,* (For other Books that are not Canonical may ſay they are, and thoſe that are ſo may ſay nothing of it:) yet we believe not this upon the Authority of your Church, but upon the Credibility of *Univerſal Tradition,* which is a thing *Credible of it ſelf,* and therefore fit to be reſted on; whereas the Authority of your Church is not ſo. And therefore your reſt thereon is not rational but meerly voluntary. I might as well reſt upon the judgment of the next man I meet, or upon a chance of a Lottery for it. For by this means I only know I might Err, but by relying on you I know I ſhould Err. But yet (to return you one ſuppoſe for another) ſuppoſe I ſhould for this and all other things ſubmit to her direction, how could ſhe aſſure me that I ſhould not be miſled by doing ſo? She pretends indeed infallibility herein, but how can ſhe aſſure us that ſhe hath it? What, by Scriptures. That you ſay cannot aſſure us of its own Infallibility, and therefore not of yours. What then, by Reaſon? That you ſay may deceive in other things, and why not in this? How then will ſhe aſſure us hereof, By ſaying ſo? Of this very affirmation there will remain the ſame Queſtion ſtill, How it can prove it ſelf to be infallibly true. Neither can there be an end of the like multiplied Demands, till we reſt in ſomething evident of it ſelf, which demonſtrates to the World that this Church is infallible. And ſeeing there is no ſuch Rock for the Infallibility of this Church to be ſetled on, it muſt of neceſſity, like the Iſland of *Delos,* flote up and down for ever. And yet upon this point according to *Papiſts* all other Controverſies in Faith depend.

26. To the 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, §.] The ſum and ſubſtance of the Ten next Paragraphs is this, *That it appears, by the Confeſſions of ſome* Proteſtants, *and the Contentions of others, that the Queſtions about the Canon of Scripture, what it is: and about the Various reading and Tranſla-*

Translations of it, which is true and which not, are not to be determined by Scripture, and therefore that all Controversies of Religion are not decidable by Scripture.

27. To which I have already answered saying, That when Scripture is affirmed to be the rule by which all Controversies of Religion are to be decided, Those are to be excepted out of this generality which are concerning the Scripture it self. For as that general saying of Scripture, *He hath put all things under his Feet*, is most true, though yet S. *Paul* tells us, *That when it is said, he hath put all things under him, it is manifest he is excepted who did put all things under him:* So when we say that all Controversies of Religion are decidable by the Scripture, it is manifest to all, but *Cavillers*, that we do and must except from this generality, those which are *touching the Scripture it self.* Just as a Merchant shewing a Ship of his own, may say, all my substance is in this Ship; and yet never intended to deny, that his Ship is part of his substance, nor yet to say that his Ship is in it self. Or as a man may say, that a whole House is supported by the Foundation, and yet never mean to exclude the Foundation from being a part of the House, or to say that it is supported by it self. Or as you your selves use to say, that the Bishop of *Rome* is head of the whole Church, and yet would think us but Captious Sophisters should we infer from hence, that either you made him no part of the whole, or else made him head of himself. Your negative conclusion therefore, that these *Questions touching Scripture, are not decidable by Scripture,* you needed not have cited any Authorities, nor urged any reason to prove it; it is evident of it self, and I grant it without more ado. But your Corollary from it, which you would insinuate to your unwary reader, *that therefore they are to be decided by your, or any Visible Church,* is a meer inconsequence, and very like his collection, who because *Pamphilus* was not to have *Glycerium* for his Wife, presently concluded that he must have her; as if there had been no more men in the World but *Pamphilus* and himself. For so you as if there were nothing in the World capable of this Office, but the Scripture,

Scripture, or the preſent Church, having concluded againſt Scripture, you conceive, but too haſtily, that you have concluded for the Church. But the truth is, neither the one nor the other have any thing to do with this matter. For firſt, the Queſtion *whether ſuch or ſuch a Book be Canonical Scripture*, though it may be decided negatively out of Scripture, by ſhewing apparent and irreconcilable contradictions between it and ſome other Book confeſſedly Canonical; yet affirmatively it cannot but only by the Teſtimonies of the ancient Churches: any Book being to be received as undoubtedly Canonical, or to be doubted of as uncertain, or rejected as Apocryphal, according as it was received, or doubted of, or rejected by them. Then for the Queſtion, *of various readings which is the true*, it is in reaſon evident and confeſſed by your own *Pope*, that there is no poſſible determination of it, but only by compariſon with ancient Copies. And laſtly for Controverſies about different Tranſlations of Scripture, the Learned have the ſame means to ſatisfie themſelves in it, as in the Queſtions which happen about the Tranſlation of any other Author, that is, skill in the Language of the Original, and comparing Tranſlations with it. In which way if there be no certainty, I would know what certainty you have, that your *Doway* Old, and *Rhemiſh* New *Teſtament* are true Tranſlations? And then for the unlearned thoſe on your Side are ſubject to as much, nay the very ſame uncertainty with thoſe on ours. Neither is there any reaſon imaginable, why an ignorant *Engliſh Proteſtant* may not be as ſecure of the Tranſlation of our Church, that it is free from Error, if not abſolutely, yet in matters of moment, as an ignorant *Engliſh Papiſt* can be of his *Rhemiſh Teſtament*, or *Doway Bible*. The beſt direction I can give them is to compare both together, & where there is no real difference (as in the Tranſlation of controverted places I believe there is very little) there to be confident, that they are right; where they differ, therefore to be prudent in the choice of the guides they follow. Which way of proceeding, if it be ſubject to ſome poſſible Error, is it the beſt that either we, or you have; and it is not required that we uſe any better than the beſt we have.

28. You

28. You will ſay, *Dependance on your Churches infallibility is a better.* I anſwer, it would be ſo, if we could be infallibly certain, that your Church is infallible, that is, if it were either evident of it ſelf, and ſeen by its own light, or could be reduced unto and ſetled upon ſome Principle that is ſo. But ſeeing you your ſelves do not ſo much as pretend, to enforce us to the belief hereof, by any proofs infallible and convincing, but only to induce us to it, by ſuch as are, by your confeſſion, only probable, and *prudential motives*; certainly it will be to very little purpoſe, to put off your uncertainty for the firſt turn, and to fall upon it at the ſecond: to pleaſe your ſelves in building your Houſe upon an imaginary Rock, when you your ſelves ſee and confeſs, that this very Rock ſtands it ſelf at the beſt but upon a frame of Timber. I anſwer ſecondly, that this cannot be a better way, becauſe we are infallibly certain that your Church is not infallible, and indeed hath not the real preſcription of this priviledge, but only pleaſeth her ſelf with a falſe imagination and vain preſumption of it: as I ſhall hereafter demonſtrate by may unanſwerable arguments.

31. But, *ſeeing the belief of the Scripture is a neceſſary thing, and cannot be proved by Scripture, how can the Church of* England *teach, as ſhe doth, Art. 6. That all things neceſſary are contained in Scripture?*

32. I have anſwered this already. And here again I ſay, That all but Cavillers will eaſily underſtand the meaning of the Article to be, That all the Divine Verities, which Chriſt revealed to his Apoſtles, and the Apoſtles taught the Churches, are contained in Scripture. That is, all the material Objects of our Faith; whereof the Scripture is none, but only the means of conveying them unto us: which we believe not finally, and for it ſelf, but for the matter contained in it. So that if men did believe the Doctrine contained in Scripture, it ſhould no way hinder their Salvation, not to know whether their were any Scripture or no. Thoſe Barbarous Nations *Irenæus* ſpeaks of were in this caſe, and yet no doubt but they might be ſaved. The end that God aims at, is the belief of the Goſpel,

the

the Covenant between God and Man; the Scripture he hath provided as a means for this end, and this alſo we are to believe, but not as the laſt Object of our Faith, but as the inſtrument of it. When therefore we ſubſcribe to the 6. *Art.* you muſt underſtand that, by *Articles of Faith,* they mean the final and ultimate Objects of it, and not the means and inſtrumental Objects;

33. But, *Proteſtants agree not in aſſigning the Canon of Holy Scripture.* Luther *and* Illyricus *reject the Epiſtle of S.* James. Kemnitius, *and other Luth. the ſecond of* Peter, *the ſecond and third of* John. *The Epiſtle to the* Heb. *the Epiſtle of* James, *of* Jude, *and the Apocalyps. Therefore without the Authority of the Church, no certainty can be had what Scripture is Canonical.*

34. So alſo the *Ancient Fathers,* and not only Fathers, but *whole Churches* differed about the certainty of the Authority of the very ſame Books: and by their difference ſhewed, they knew no neceſſity of conforming themſelves herein to the judgment of your or any Church. For had they done ſo, they muſt have agreed all with that Church, and conſequently among themſelves. Now I pray tell me plainly, Had they ſufficient certainty what Scripture was Canonical, or had they not? If they had not, it ſeems there is no ſuch great harm or danger in not having ſuch a certainty whether ſome Books be Canonical or no, as you require: If they had, why may not *Proteſtants,* notwithſtanding their differences, have ſufficient certainty hereof, as well as the Ancient Fathers and Churches, notwithſtanding theirs?

35. You proceed. And whereas the *Proteſtants* of *England* in the 6. *Art.* have theſe Words, *In the name of the Holy Scripture we do underſtand thoſe Books, of whoſe Authority was never any doubt in the Church*; you demand, *what they mean by them? Whether that by the Churches conſent they are aſſured what Scriptures be Canonical?* I Anſwer for them. Yes, they are ſo. And whereas you infer from hence, *This is to make the Church Judge:* I have told you already, That *of this Controverſie we make the Church the Judge*; but not the preſent Church, much leſs the

the preſent *Roman* Church, but the conſent and Teſtimony of the *Ancient and Primitive Church*. Which though it be but a highly probable inducement, and no demonſtrative enforcement, yet methinks you ſhould not deny but it may be a ſufficient ground of Faith: Whoſe Faith, even of the Foundation of all your Faith, your Churches Authority, is built laſtly and wholly upon *Prudential Motives*.

36. But *by this Rule the whole Book of* Eſther *muſt quit the Canon; becauſe it was excluded by ſome in the Church:* by *Melito, Athanaſius,* and *Gregory Nazianzen*. Then for ought I know he that ſhould think he had reaſon to exclude it now, might be ſtill in the Church as well as *Melito, Athanaſius, Nazianzen* were. And while you thus inveigh againſt *Luther,* and charge him with Luciferian Hereſies, for doing that which you in this very place confeſs that Saints in Heaven before him have done, *are you not partial and a Judge of evil thoughts?*

37. *Luther's* cenſures of *Eccleſiaſtes, Job,* and the *Prophets,* though you make ſuch Tragedies with them, I ſee none of them but is capable of a tolerable conſtruction, and far from having in them any Fundamental Hereſie. He that condemns him for ſaying, the Book of *Eccleſiaſtes is not full, That it hath many abrupt things,* condemns him, for ought I can ſee, for ſpeaking truth. And the reſt of the cenſure is but a bold and blunt expreſſion of the ſame thing. The Book of *Job* may be a true Hiſtory, and yet as many true Stories are, and have been an Argument of a Fable to ſet before us an example of Patience. And though the Books of the Prophets were not written by themſelves, but by their Diſciples, yet it does not follow that they were written caſually: (Though I hope you will not damn all for Hereticks, that ſay, ſome Books of Scripture were written caſually.) Neither is there any reaſon they ſhould the ſooner be called in queſtion for being written by their Diſciples, ſeeing being ſo written they had atteſtation from themſelves. Was the Propheſie of *Jeremy* the leſs Canonical, for being written by *Baruch*? Or becauſe S. *Peter* the Maſter dictated the

Goſpel, and S. *Mark* the Scholar writ it, is it the more likely to be called in Queſtion?

38. But leaving *Luther*, you return to our *Engliſh* Canon of Scripture; And tell us, that in *the New Teſtament, by the above mentioned rule, (of whoſe Authority was never any doubt in the Church) divers Books muſt be diſcanonized.* Not ſo. For I may believe even thoſe queſtioned Books to have been written by the Apoſtles and to be Canonical: but I cannot in Reaſon believe this of them ſo undoubtedly, as of *thoſe Books which were never queſtioned.* At leaſt I have no warrant to damn any man that ſhall doubt of them or deny them now: having the example of Saints in Heaven, either to juſtifie, or excuſe ſuch their doubting or denial.

39. You obſerve in the next place, that *our ſixth Article, ſpecifying by name all the Books of the* Old Teſtament, *ſhuffles over theſe of the* New *with this generality --- All the Books of the* New Teſtament, *as they are commonly received, we do receive, and account them Canonical:* And in this you fancy to your ſelf *a myſtery of iniquity.* But if this be all the ſhuffling that the Church of *England* is guilty of, I believe the Church, as well as the King, may give for her Motto, *Honi ſoit qui mal y penſe.* For all the Bibles which ſince the Compoſing of the Articles have been uſed and allowed by the *Church of England*, do teſtifie and even proclaim to the World, that by -- *Commonly received*, they meant, *received by the Church of* Rome, *and other Churches before the Reformation.* I pray take the pains to look in them, and there you ſhall find the Books which the Church of *England* counts Apocryphal marked out and ſevered from the reſt, with this Title in the beginning, *The Books called Apocrypha*; and with this cloſe or Seal in the End, *The End of the Apocrypha.* And having told you by name, and in particular, what Books only She Eſteems *Apocryphal*, I hope you will not put Her to the trouble of telling you that the reſt are in Her judgment *Canonical.*

40. *But if by Commonly received, She meant, by the Church of* Rome; *Then by the ſame reaſon, muſt She receive divers Books of the* Old Teſtament *which She rejects.* Cer-

41. Certainly a very good Conſequence. The Church of *England* receives the Books of the *New Teſtament*, which the Church of *Rome* receives; Therefore ſhe muſt receive the Books of the *Old Teſtament* which ſhe receives. As if you ſhould ſay, If you will do as we, in one thing, you muſt in all things. If you will pray to God with us, you muſt pray to Saints with us. If you hold with us, when we have reaſon on our ſide, you muſt do ſo, when we have no reaſon.

43. But, *with what Coherence can we ſay in the former part of the Article, That by Scripture we mean thoſe Books that were never doubted of; and in the latter ſay, We receive all the Books of the* New Teſtament, *as they are commonly received, whereas of them many were doubted?* I anſwer. When they ſay, *of whoſe Authority there was never any doubt in the Church*, They mean not, thoſe only of whoſe Authority there was ſimply no doubt at all, by any man in the Church; But ſuch as were not at any time doubted of by the whole Church, or by all Churches, but had atteſtation, though not Univerſal, yet at leaſt ſufficient to make conſidering men receive them for Canonical. In which number they may well reckon thoſe Epiſtles which were ſometimes doubted of by ſome, yet whoſe number and Authority was not ſo great, as to prevail againſt the contrary ſuffrages.

44. But, *if to be commonly received, paſs for a good Rule to know the Canon of the* New Teſtament *by, why not of the Old?* You conclude many times very well, but ſtill when you do ſo, it is out of principles which no man grants. For who ever told you, that to be *commonly* received is a good Rule to know the Canon of the *New Teſtament* by? Have you been trained up in Schools of ſubtilty, and cannot you ſee a great difference, between theſe two, We receive the Books of the *New Teſtament as they are* commonly received, and we receive thoſe that are commonly received, *becauſe they are ſo?* To ſay this, were indeed to make, *being commonly received*, a Rule or Reaſon to know the Canon by. But to ſay the former, doth no more make it a Rule, than you ſhould make the Church of *England* the rule of your receiving them, if you ſhould

ſay, as you may, The Books of the *New Teſtament* we receive for Canonical, as they are received by the Church of *England.*

45. You demand, *upon what infallible ground we agree with* Luther *againſt you, in ſome, and with you againſt* Luther *in others?* And I alſo demand upon what infallible ground you hold your Canon, and agree neither with us, nor *Luther?* For ſure your differing from us both, is of it ſelf no more apparently reaſonable, than our agreeing with you in part, and in part with *Luther.* If you ſay, your Churches Infallibility is your ground: I demand again ſome Infallible ground both for the Churches Infallibility, and for this, that *Yours is the Church*; and ſhall never ceaſe multiplying demands upon demands, until you ſettle me upon a Rock; I mean, give ſuch an anſwer, whoſe Truth is ſo evident that it needs no further evidence. If you ſay, *This is Univerſal Tradition:* I reply, your Churches Infallibility is not built upon it, and that the Canon of Scripture, as we receive it, is. For we do not profeſs our ſelves ſo abſolutely, and undoubtedly certain; neither do we urge others to be ſo, of thoſe Books, which have been doubted, as of thoſe that never have.

46. The Concluſion of your Tenth. §. is, That *the Divinity of a writing cannot be known from it ſelf alone, but by ſome extrinſecal Authority*: Which you need not prove, for no Wiſe Man denies it. But then this authority is that of *Univerſal Tradition,* not of your Church. For to me it is altogether as αὐτόπιστον, that the Goſpel of *Saint Matthew* is the Word of God, as that all which your Church ſays is true.

47. That Believers of the Scripture, by conſidering the Divine matter, the excellent precepts, the glorious promiſes contained in it, may be confirmed in their Faith, of the Scriptures Divine Authority; and that among other inducements and inforcements hereunto, internal arguments have their place and force, certainly no man of underſtandeng can deny. For my part I profeſs, if the Doctrine of the Scripture were not as good, and as fit to come from the Fountain of goodneſs, as

the

the Miracles, by which it was confirmed, were great, I ſhould want one main pillar of my Faith, and for want of it, I fear ſhould be much ſtaggered in it. Now this and nothing elſe did the *Doctor* mean in ſaying, *The Believer ſees, by that glorious beam of Divine light which ſhines in Scripture, and by many internal Arguments, that the Scripture is of Divine Authority. By this* (ſaith he) *he ſees it*, that is, he is moved to, and ſtrengthened in his belief of it: and by this partly, not wholly; by this, not alone, but with the concurrence of other Arguments. He that will quarrel with him for ſaying ſo, muſt find fault with the *Maſter of the Sentences*, and all his *Scholars*, for they all ſay the ſame.

48. In the next Diviſion, out of your liberality, you will ſuppoſe, that Scripture, like to a corporal light, is *by it ſelf alone* able to determine and move our underſtanding to aſſent: yet notwithſtanding this ſuppoſal, *Faith ſtill* (you ſay) *muſt go before Scripture, becauſe as the light is viſible only to thoſe that have eyes: ſo the Scripture only to thoſe that have the Eye of Faith.* But to my underſtanding, if Scripture do move and determine our Underſtanding to aſſent, then the Scripture, and its moving muſt be before this aſſent, as the cauſe muſt be before its own effect; now this very aſſent is nothing elſe but Faith, and Faith nothing elſe than the Underſtandings aſſent. And therefore (upon this ſuppoſal) Faith doth, and muſt originally proceed from Scripture, as the effect from its proper cauſe: and the influence and efficacy of Scripture is to be preſuppoſed before the aſſent of Faith, unto which it moves and determines, and conſequently if this ſuppoſition of yours were true, there ſhould need no other means precedent to Scripture to beget Faith, Scripture it ſelf being able (as here you ſuppoſe) to determine and move the underſtanding to aſſent, that is to believe them, and the Verities contained in them. Neither is this to ſay, that the Eyes with which we ſee, are made by the light by which we ſee. For you are miſtaken much, if you conceive that in this compariſon, Faith anſwers to the Eye. But if you will not pervert it, the Analogy muſt

muſt ſtand thus-; Scripture muſt anſwer to light; The Eye of the Soul, that is the Underſtanding, or the faculty of aſſenting, to the bodily Eye; And laſtly aſſenting or believing to the Act of ſeeing. As therefore the light, determining the Eye to ſee, though it preſuppoſes the Eye which it determines, as every Action doth the Object on which it is imployed, yet it ſelf is preſuppoſed and antecedent to the Act of ſeeing, as the cauſe is always to its effect: So, if you will ſuppoſe that Scripture, like light, moves the underſtanding to aſſent, The Underſtanding (that's the Eye and Object on which it works) muſt be before this influence upon it; But the Aſſent, that is the belief whereof the Scripture moves, and the underſtanding is moved, which anſwers to the Act of ſeeing, muſt come after. For if it did aſſent already, to what purpoſe ſhould the Scripture do that which was done before? Nay indeed how were it poſſible it ſhould be ſo, any more than a Father can beget a Son that he hath already? Or an Architect build an Houſe that is built already? Or than this very world can be made again before it be unmade? Tranſubſtantiation indeed is fruitful of ſuch Monſters. But they that have not ſworn themſelves to the defence of Error, will eaſily perceive, that *Jam factum facere*, and *Factum infectum facere*, are equally impoſſible. But I digreſs.

49. The cloſe of this Paragraph, is a fit cover for ſuch a Diſh. There you tell us, That *if there muſt be ſome other means precedent to Scripture to beget Faith, this can be no other than the Church.* By the Church, we know you do, and muſt underſtand the *Roman Church*: ſo that in effect you ſay, no man can have Faith, but he muſt be moved to it by your Churches Authority. And that is to ſay, that the King and all other *Proteſtants*, to whom you write, though they verily think they are Chriſtians and believe the Goſpel, becauſe they aſſent to the truth of it, and would willingly Die for it, yet indeed are Infidels and believe nothing. The Scripture tells us, *The Heart of man knoweth no Man, but the Spirit of Man which is in him.* And who are you, to take upon you to make us

believe

believe, that we do not believe, what we know we do? But if I may think verily that I believe the Scripture, and yet not believe it; how know you that you believe the *Roman Church?* I am as verily, and as ſtrongly perſuaded that I believe the Scripture, as you are that you believe the Church. And if I may be deceived, why may not you? Again, what more ridiculous, and againſt ſenſe and experience, than to affirm, That there are not Millions amongſt you and us that believe, upon no other reaſon than their Education, and the authority of their Parents and Teachers, and the Opinion they have of them? The tenderneſs of the ſubject, and aptneſs to receive impreſſions, ſupplying the defect and imperfection of the Agent! And will you proſcribe from Heaven all thoſe believers of your own Creed, who do indeed lay the Foundation of their Faith (for I cannot call it by any other name) no deeper than upon the Authority of their Father, or Maſter, or Pariſh Prieſt? Certainly, if theſe have no true Faith, your Church is very full of Infidels. Suppoſe *Xaverius* by the Holineſs of his Life had converted ſome *Indians* to Chriſtianity, who could (for ſo I will ſuppoſe) have no knowledge of your Church but from him, and therefore muſt laſt of all build their Faith of the Church upon their Opinion of *Xaverius*: Do theſe remain as very *Pagans* after their Converſion, as they were before? Are they brought to aſſent in their Souls, and obey in their Lives the Goſpel of Chriſt, only to be Tantalized and not ſaved, and not benefited but deluded by it, becauſe, forſooth, it is a man and not the Church that begets Faith in them? What if their motive to believe be not in reaſon ſufficient? Do they therefore not believe what they do believe, becauſe they do it upon ſufficient motives? They chooſe the Faith imprudently parhaps, but yet they do chooſe it. Unleſs you will have us believe that, that which is done, is not done, becauſe it is not done upon good reaſon: which is to ſay, that never any man living ever did a fooliſh action. But yet I know not why the Authority of one Holy Man, which apparently has no ends upon me, joyned with the goodneſs

goodneſs of the Chriſtian Faith, might not be a far greater and more rational motive to me to embrace Chriſtianity, than any I can have to continue in *Paganiſm.* And therefore for ſhame, if not for Love of Truth, you muſt recant this fancy when you write again: and ſuffer true Faith to be many times, where your Churches Infallibility has no hand in the begetting of it. And be content to tell us hereafter, that we believe not enough, and not go about to perſuade us, we believe nothing, for fear with telling us what we know to be manifeſtly falſe, you ſhould gain only this, *Not to be believed when you ſpeak truth.* Some pretty Sophiſms you may happily bring us to make us believe, we believe nothing: but Wiſe men know that Reaſon againſt Experience is alwaies Sophiſtical. And therefore as he that could not anſwer *Zeno's* ſubtilties againſt the exiſtence of Motion, could yet confute them by doing that, which he pretended could not be done: So if you ſhould give me a hundred Arguments to perſuade me, becauſe I do not believe Tranſubſtantiation, I do not believe in God, and the *Knots* of them I could not unty, yet I ſhould cut them in pieces with doing that, and knowing that I do ſo, which you pretend I cannot do.

53. It is ſuperfluous for you to prove *out of* S. Athanaſius, *and* Auſtine *that we muſt receive the ſacred Canon upon the credit of Gods Church.* Underſtanding by Church, as here you explain your ſelf, *The Credit of Tradition.* And that not the Tradition of the Preſent Church, which we pretend may deviate from the Ancient, but *ſuch a Tradition, which involves an evidence of Fact, and from Hand to Hand, from Age to Age, bringing us up to the times and Perſons of the Apoſtles, and our Saviour Himſelf, commeth to be confirmed by all theſe Miracles, and other Arguments, whereby they convinced their Doctrine to be true.* Thus you. Now prove the Canon of Scripture which you receive by ſuch Tradition and we will allow it. Prove your whole Doctrine, or the Infallibility of your Church by ſuch a Tradition, and we will yield to you in all things. Take the alledged places of S. *Athanaſius*, and S. *Auſtin*, in this ſenſe,

ſenſe, (which is your own,) and they will not preſs us any thing at all. We will ſay, with *Athanaſius, That only four Goſpels are to be received, becauſe the Canons of the Holy and* Catholick *Church* (underſtand of *all Ages* ſince the perfection of the Canon) *have ſo determined.*

54. We will ſubſcribe to S. *Auſtin,* and ſay, That *we alſo would not believe the Goſpel, unleſs the Authority of the Catholick Church did move us,* (meaning by the Church, *the Church of all Ages,* and that ſucceſſion of Chriſtians which takes in *Chriſt himſelf* and his *Apoſtles.*) Neither would *Zwinglius* have needed to cry out upon this ſaying, had he conceived as you now do, that by the Catholick Church, the Church of all Ages, ſince Chriſt, was to be underſtood. As for the Council of *Carthage,* it may ſpeak not of ſuch Books only, as were certainly Canonical, and for the regulating of Faith, but alſo of thoſe which were only profitable, and lawful to be read in the Church. Which in *England* is a very ſlender Argument that the Book is Canonical, where every body knows that Apocryphal Books are read as well as Canonical. But howſoever, if you underſtand by Fathers, not only their immediate Fathers and Predeceſſors in the Goſpel, but the ſucceſſion of them from the Apoſtles; they are right in the Theſis, that *whatſoever is received from theſe Fathers, as Canonical, is to be ſo eſteemed*; Though in the application of it, to this or that particular Book they may happily Err, and think that Book received as Canonical, which was only received as Profitable to be read; and think that Book, received alwaies, and by all, which was rejected by ſome, and doubted of by many.

55. *But we cannot be certain, in what Language the Scriptures remain uncorrupted.* CHIL. Not ſo certain, I grant, as of that which we can demonſtrate: But certain enough, morally certain, as certain as the nature of the thing will bear. So certain we may be, and God requires no more. We may be as certain as S. *Auſtin* was, who in his *ſecond Book of Baptiſm, againſt the Donatiſts, c.* 3. plainly implies, *the Scripture might poſſibly be corrupted.* He means ſure in matters of little moment, ſuch as con-

certain not the Covenant between God and Man. But thus he ſaith. The ſame S. *Auſtin* in his 48. *Epiſt.* clearly intimates, [a] That *in his judgment, the only preſervative of the Scriptures integrity, was the Tranſlating it into ſo many Languages, and the general and perpetual uſe and reading of it in the Church: for want whereof the works of particular Doctors were more expoſed to danger in this kind*; but the Canonical Scripture being by this means guarded with Univerſal care and dilligence was not obnoxious to ſuch attempts. And this aſſurance of the Scriptures incorruption, is common to us with him; we therefore are as certain hereof as S. *Auſtin* was, and that I hope was certain enough. Yet if this does not ſatisfie you, I ſay farther, We are as certain hereof as your own *Pope Sixtus Quintus* was. He in his *Preface to his Bible* tells us, [b] That *in the preveſtigation of the true and genuine Text, it was perſpicuouſly manifeſt to all men, that there was no Argument more firm and certain to be relied upon, than the Faith of Ancient Books.* Now this ground we have to build upon as well as He had: and therefore our certainty is as great, and ſtands upon as certain ground as his did.

[a] *Neque enim ſic poſſit integritas atque notitia literarum quamlibet illuſtris Epiſcopi, e ſtoliri, quemadmodum ſcriptura Canonica tot linguarum literis & ordine & ſucceſſione celebrationis Eccleſiaſticæ cuſtoditur; contra quam non defuerunt tamen, qui ſub nominibus Apoſtolorum multa confingerent. Fruſtra quidem; Quia illa ſic commendata, ſic celebrata, ſic nota eſt. Verum quid poſſit adverſus literas non Canonica authoritate fundatas etiam hinc demonſtrabit impiæ conatus audaciæ, quod & adverſus eos quæ tanta notitiæ mole firmatæ ſunt, ſeſe erigere non prætermiſit.* Aug. ep. 48. *ad* Vincent. *contra* Donat & Rogat. [b] *In hac Germani textus perveſtigatione, ſatis perſpicue inter omnes conſtat, nullum argumentum eſſe certius ac firmius, quam antiquorem probatorum codicum latinorum fidem,* &c. *ſic* Sixtus in præfat.

56. This is not all I have to ſay in this matter. For I will add moreover, that we are as certain in what Language the Scripture is uncorrupted, as any man in your Church was, until *Clement* the 8th ſet forth your own approved *Edition of your Vulgar* Tranſlation. For you do not, nor cannot, without extreme impudence deny, that until then, there was great variety of Copies currant in divers parts of your Church, and thoſe very frequent in various lections: all which Copies might poſſibly be falſe in ſome things, but more than one ſort of them, could not poſſibly be true in all things. Neither were it leſs impudence

impudence to pretend, that any man in your Church, could until *Clements*'s time have any certainty what that one true Copy and reading was (if there were any one perfectly true.) Some indeed that had got *Sixtus his Bible*, might after the Edition of that very likely think themſelves cock-ſure of a perfect true uncorrupted Tranſlation, without being beholden to *Clement*; but how fouly they were abuſed and deceived that thought ſo, the Edition of *Clemens*, differing from that of *Sixtus* in a great multitude of places, doth ſufficiently demonſtrate.

57. This certainty therefore in what Language the Scripture remains uncorrupted, is it neceſſary to have it, or is it not? If it be not, I hope we may do well enough without it. If it be neceſſary, what became of your Church for 1500 Years together? All which time you muſt confeſs ſhe had no ſuch certainty: no one man being able truly and upon good ground to ſay, *This or that Copy of the Bible is pure, and perfect, and uncorrupted in all things.* And now at this preſent, though ſome of you are grown to a higher degree of Preſumption in this point, yet are you as far as ever, from any true and real, and rational aſſurance of the abſolute purity of your Authentick Tranſlation: which I ſuppoſe my ſelf to have proved unanſwerably in divers places.

58. Ad 16. §.] *C. M.* Objects to *Proteſtants*, That *their Tranſlations of the Scripture are very different, and by each other mutually condemned.* Luthers *Tranſlation by* Zwinglius, *and others:* That *of the* Zwinglians *by* Luther. *The Tranſlation of* Oecolampadius, *by the Divines of* Baſil: *that of* Caſtalio *by* Beza: *That of* Beza *by* Caſtalio. *That of* Calvin, *by* Carolus Molinæus. *That of* Geneva *by* M. Parks, *and* King James. *And laſtly one of our Tranſlations by the* Puritans.

59. *CHIL.* All which might have been as juſtly objected againſt that great variety of Tranſlations extant in the Primitive Church, and made uſe of by the Fathers and Doctors of it. For which I deſire not that my word, but S. *Auſtins* may be taken. *They which have Tranſlated the Scriptures out of the* Hebrew *into* Greek, *may be num-*

bred, but the Latine *Interpreters are innumerable. For whenſoever any one, in the firſt times of Chriſtianity, met with a* Greek Bible, *and ſeemed to himſelf to have ſome ability in both Languages, he preſently ventured upon an Interpretation.* So *He*, in his *ſecond Book of Chriſtian Doctrine. Cap.* 11. Of all theſe, that which was called the *Italian Tranſlation* was eſteemed beſt; ſo we may learn from the ſame S. *Auſtin in the* 15. *Chap. of the ſame Book. Amongſt all theſe Interpretations* (ſaith he) *let the* Italian *be preferred: for it keeps cloſer to the Letter, and is perſpicuous in the ſenſe.* Yet ſo far was the Church of that time from perſuming upon the abſolute purity and perfection, even of this beſt Tranſlation, that S. *Hierome* thought it neceſſary to make a new Tranſlation of the *Old Teſtament*, out of the *Hebrew* Fountain, (which himſelf teſtifies in his Book *de Viris Illuſtribus,*) And to correct the vulgar verſion of the *New Teſtament*, according to the truth of the Original *Greek*; amending many Errors which had crept into it, whether by the miſtake of the Author, or the negligence of the Tranſcribers; which work he undertook and performed at the requeſt of *Damaſus*, Biſhop of *Rome. You conſtrain me* (ſaith he) *to make a new Work of an old: that after the Copies of the Scriptures have been diſperſed through the whole World, I ſhould ſit as it were an Arbitrator amongſt them, and becauſe they vary among themſelves, ſhould determine what are thoſe things* (*in them*) *which conſent with the* Greek *verity.* And after: *Therefore this preſent Preface promiſes the four Goſpels only corrected by collation with* Greek *Copies. But that they might not be very diſſonant from the Cuſtome of the* Latine *reading, I have ſo tempered with my ſtile, the Tranſlation of the Ancients, that, thoſe things amended wich did ſeem to change the ſenſe, other things I have ſuffered to remain as they were.* So that in this matter *Proteſtants* muſt either ſtand or fall with the Primitive Church.

62. C. M. *But the Faith of* Proteſtants *relies upon Scripture alone; Scripture is delivered to moſt of them by Tranſlations; Tranſlations depend upon the skill and honeſty of Men, who certainly may Err becauſe they are Men, and certainly*

do Err, at leaſt ſome of them, becauſe their Tranſlations are contrary. It ſeems then the Faith, and conſequently the Salvation of Proteſtants *relies upon fallible and uncertain grounds.*

63. *CHIL.* This Objection, though it may ſeem to do you great ſervice for the preſent; yet I fear you will repent the time that ever you urged it againſt us as a fault, that we make mens ſalvation *depend upon uncertainties.* For the Objection returns upon you many ways, as firſt thus; The Salvation of many Millions of *Papiſts* (as they ſuppoſe and teach) depends upon their having the Sacrament of Pennance truly adminiſtred unto them. This again upon the Miniſter's being a true Prieſt. That ſuch or ſuch a man is Prieſt, not himſelf, much leſs any other can have any poſſible certainty: for it depends upon a great many contingent and uncertain ſuppoſals. He that will pretend to be certain of it, muſt undertake to know for a certain all theſe things that follow.

64. Firſt that he was Baptized with due matter. Secondly, with the due form of Words, (which he cannot know, unleſs he were both preſent and attentive.) Thirdly, he muſt know that he was Baptized with due Intention, and that is, that the Miniſter of his Baptiſm was not a ſecret *Jew*, nor a *Moore*, nor an *Atheiſt*, (of all which kinds, I fear experience gives you juſt cauſe to fear, that *Italy* and *Spain* have Prieſts not a few,) but a Chriſtian in Heart, as well as Profeſſion; (otherwiſe believing the Sacrament to be nothing, in giving it he could intend to give nothing.) nor a *Samoſatenian*, nor an *Arrian*: but one that was capable of having due intention, from which they that believe not the Doctrine of the Trinity are excluded by you. And laſtly, that he was neither Drunk not Diſtracted at the adminiſtration of the Sacrament, nor out of negligence or malice omitted his intention.

65. Fourthly, he muſt undertake to know, that the Biſhop which ordained him Prieſt, ordained him compleatly with due Matter, Form and Intention: and conſequently, that he again was neither *Jew*, nor *Moore*, nor *Atheiſt*, nor liable to any ſuch exception, as is unconſiſtent with due Intention in giving the Sacrament of Orders. 66.

66. Fifthly, he muſt undertake to know, that the Biſhop which made him Prieſt, was a Prieſt himſelf, for your rule is, *Nihil dat quod non habet*: And conſequently, that there was again none of the former nullities in his Baptiſm, which might make him incapable of Ordination; nor no invalidity in his Ordination, but a true Prieſt to ordain him again, the requiſite matter and form and due intention all concurring.

67. Laſtly, he muſt pretend to know the ſame of him that made him Prieſt, and him that made Him Prieſt, even until he comes to the very Fountain of Prieſthood. For take any one in the whole train and ſucceſſion of Ordainers, and ſuppoſe him, by reaſon of any defect, only a ſuppoſed and not a true Prieſt, then according to your Doctrine he could not give a true, but only a ſuppoſed Prieſthood; and they that receive it of him, and again, they that derive it from them, can give no better than they received; receiving nothing but a name and ſhadow, can give nothing but a name and ſhadow: and ſo from Age to Age, from Generation to Generation being equivocal Fathers, beget only equivocal Sons; No Principle in Geometry being more certain than this, That *the unſuppliable defect of any neceſſary Antecedent, muſt needs cauſe a nullity of all thoſe Conſequences which depend upon it.* In fine, to know this one thing, you muſt firſt know Ten Thouſand others, whereof not any one is a thing that can be known; there being no neceſſity that it ſhould be true, which only can qualifie any thing for an Object of Science, but only, at the beſt, a high degree of probability that it is ſo. But then, that of Ten Thouſand probables no one ſhould be falſe; that of Ten Thouſand requiſites, whereof any one may fail, not one ſhould be wanting, this to me is extremely improbable, and even Couſin-german to Impoſſible. So that the aſſurance hereof is like a Machine compoſed of an innumerable multitude of pieces, of which it is ſtrangely unlikely but ſome will be out of order; and yet if any one be ſo, the whole Fabrick of neceſſity falls to the ground. And he that ſhall put together, and maturely conſider all the poſſible ways

ways of lapſing, and nullifying a Prieſthood in the Church of *Rome*, I believe will be very inclinable to think, that it is an hundred to one, that amongſt a hundred ſeeming Prieſts, there is not one true one. Nay, that it is not a thing very improbable, that amongſt thoſe many millions, which make up the *Romiſh Hierarchy*, there are *not twenty* true. But be the truth in this what it will be, once this is certain, that They which makes mens Salvation (as you do) depend upon Prieſtly Abſolution, and this again (as you do) upon the Truth and reality of the Prieſthood that gives it, and this laſtly upon a great multitude of apparent uncertainties, are not the fitteſt men in the World, to object to others as a horrible crime, *That they make mens Salvation depend upon fallible and uncertain Foundations.* And let this be the firſt retortion of your Argument.

68. But ſuppoſe this difficulty aſſoiled, and that an Angel from Heaven ſhould aſcertain you (for other aſſurances you can have none) that the Perſon, you make uſe of, is a true Prieſt, and a competent Miniſter of the Sacrament of Pennance; yet ſtill the doubt will remain, whether he will do you that good which he can do, whether he will pronounce the abſolving words with intent to abſolve you! For perhaps he may bear you ſome ſecret malice, and project to himſelf your damnation, for a compleat *Italian* revenge. Parhaps (as the tale is of a Prieſt that was lately burnt in *France*) he may upon ſome conditions have compacted with the Devil to give no Sacraments with Intention. Laſtly, he may be (for ought you can poſſibly know) a ſecret *Jew*, or *Moor*, or *Anti-Trinitarian*, or perhaps ſuch a one as is ſo far from intending your forgiveneſs of ſins and Salvation by this Sacrament, that in his heart he laughs at all theſe things, and thinks Sin nothing, and Salvation a word. All theſe doubts you muſt have clearly reſolved (which can hardly be done but by another Revelation,) before you can upon good grounds aſſure your ſelf, that your true Prieſt gives you true and effectual abſolution. So that when you have done as much as God requires for your Salvation, yet can you by no means be ſecure, but that you may have the

ill

ill luck to be Damned: which is to make Salvation a matter of chance, and not of choice, and which a man may fail of, not only by an ill life, but by ill Fortune. Verily a moſt comfortable Doctrine for a conſidering man lying upon Death bed, who either feels or fears that his repentance is but attrition only, and not contrition, and conſequently believes that if he be not abſolved really by a true Prieſt, he cannot poſſibly eſcape damnation. Such a man for his comfort, you tell, firſt (you that will have *mens Salvation depend upon no uncertainties,*) that though he verily believe that his ſorrow for ſins is a true ſorrow, and his purpoſe of amendment a true purpoſe; yet he may deceive himſelf, perhaps it is not, and if it be not, he muſt be damned. Yet you bid him hope well: But *Spes eſt rei incertæ nomen.* You tell him ſecondly, that though the party he confeſſes to, ſeem to be a true Prieſt, yet for ought he knows, or for ought himſelf knows, by reaſon of ſome ſecret undiſcernable invalidity in his Baptiſm or Ordination, he may be none: and if he be none, he can do nothing. This is a hard ſaying, but this is not the worſt. You tell him thirdly, that he may may be in ſuch a ſtate that he cannot, or if he can, that he will not give the Sacrament with due Intention: and if he does not, all's in vain. Put caſe a man by theſe conſiderations ſhould be caſt into ſome agonies; what advice, what comfort would you give him? Verily I know not what you could ſay to him, but this; that firſt for the Qualification required on his part, he might know that he deſired to have true ſorrow, and that that is ſufficient. But then if he ſhould ask you, why he might not know his ſorrow to be a true ſorrow, as well as his deſire to be ſorrowful, to be a true deſire, I believe you would be put to ſilence. Then ſecondly, to quiet his fears, concerning the Prieſt and his intention you ſhould tell him, by my advice, that Gods goodneſs (which will not ſuffer him to damn men for not doing better than their beſt,) will ſupply all ſuch defects as to humane endeavours were unavoidable. And therefore though his Prieſt were indeed no Prieſt, yet to him he ſhould be as if he were one: and if he gave Abſolution with-

without Intention, yet in doing ſo he ſhould hurt himſelf only and not his penitent. This were ſome comfort indeed, and this were to ſettle mens Salvation upon reaſonable certain grounds. But this I fear you will never ſay; for this were to reverſe many Doctrines eſtabliſhed by your Church, and beſides to degrade your Prieſthood from a great part of their honour, by leſſening the ſtrict neceſſity of the Laities dependance upon them. For it were to ſay, that *the Prieſts Intention is not neceſſary to the obtaining of abſolution*; which is to ſay, that it is not in the Parſons power to damn whom he will in his Pariſh, becauſe by this Rule, God ſhould ſupply the defect which his malice had cauſed. And beſides it were to ſay, that *Infants dying without Baptiſm might be ſaved*, God ſupplying the want of Baptiſm which to them is unavoidable. But beyond all this, it were to put into my mouth a full and ſatisfying anſwer to your Argument, which I am now returning, ſo that in anſwering my objection you ſhould anſwer your own. For then I ſhould tell you, that it were altogether as abhorrent from the goodneſs of God, and as repugnant to it, to ſuffer an ignorant Lay-mans Soul to periſh, meerly for being miſled by an undiſcernable falſe Tranſlation, which yet was commended to him by the Church, which (being of neceſſity to credit ſome in this matter) he had reaſon to rely upon either above all other, or as much as any other, as it is to damn a penitent ſinner for a ſecret defect in that deſired Abſolution, which his Goſtly Father perhaps was an *Atheiſt* and could not give him, or was a villiain and would not. This anſwer therefore, which alone would ſerve to comfort your penitent in his perplexities, and to aſſure him that he cannot fail of Salvation if he will not, for fear of inconveniencies you muſt forbear. And ſeeing you muſt, I hope you will come down from the Pulpit, and Preach no more againſt others for *making mens Salvation depend upon fallible and uncertain grounds*, leſt by judging others, you make your ſelves and your own Church inexcuſable, who are ſtrongly guilty of this fault, above all the men and Churches of the World: whereof I have already

given you two very pregnant demonſtrations, drawn from your preſumptions tying God and Salvation to your Sacraments; And the efficacy of them to your Prieſts Qualifications and Intentions.

69. Your making the Salvation of Infants depend on Baptiſm a Caſual thing, and in the power of man to confer, or not confer, would yield me a Third of the ſame nature. And your ſuſpending the ſame on the Baptizers intention a Fourth. And laſtly your making the Real preſence of Chriſt in the Euchariſt depend upon the caſualties of the Conſecrators true Prieſthood and Intention, and yet commanding men to believe it for certain that he is preſent, and to adore the Sacrament, which according to your Doctrine, for ought they can poſſibly know, may be nothing elſe but a piece of Bread, ſo expoſing them to the danger of Idolatry, and conſequently of Damnation, doth offer me a Fifth demonſtration of the ſame concluſion, if I thought fit to inſiſt upon them. But I have no mind to draw any more out of this Fountain; neither do I think it Charity to cloy the Reader with uniformity, when the Subject affords variety.

70. Sixthly, therefore I return it thus. The Faith of *Papiſts* relies alone upon their Churches infallibility. That there is any Church infallible, and that theirs is it, they pretend not to believe, but only upon *prudential motives.* Dependance upon prudential motives they confeſs to be obnoxious to a poſſibility of erring. What then remaineth but Truth, Faith, Salvation, and all muſt in them rely upon a fallible and uncertain ground!

71. Seventhly, The Faith of *Papiſts* relies upon the Church alone. The Doctrine of the Church is delivered to moſt of them by their Pariſh Prieſt, or Ghoſtly Father, or at leaſt by a company of Prieſts, who for the moſt part ſure, are men and not Angels, in whom nothing is more certain than a moſt certain poſſibility to Err. What then remaineth but that Truth, Faith, Salvation and all, muſt in them rely upon a fallible and uncertain ground.

72. Eighthly

72. Eighthly thus. It is apparent and undeniable, that many Thousands there are, who believe your Religion upon no better grounds, than a man may have for the belief almost of any Religion. As some believe it, because their Forefathers did so, and they were good People. Some, because they were Christened, and brought up in it. Some, because it is the Religion of their Country, where all other Religions are persecuted and proscribed. Some, because *Protestants* cannot shew a perpetual succession of Professors of all their Doctrine. Some, because the service of your Church is more stately, and pompous, and magnificent. Some, because they find comfort in it. Some, because your Religion is farther spread, and hath more Professors of it, than the Religion of *Protestants*. Some, because *your* Priests *compass Sea and Land to gain Proselytes to it.* Lastly, an infinite number, by chance, and they know not why, but only because they are sure they are in the right. This which I say is a most certain experimented Truth, and if you will deal ingeniously, you will not deny it. And without question he that builds his Faith upon our *English Translation*, goes upon a more prudent ground than any of these can, with reason, be pretended to be. What then can you alledge but that, with you, rather than with us, Truth and Faith and Salvation and all relies upon fallible and uncertain grounds.

73. Ninthly. Your *Rhemish* and *Doway* Translations are delivered to your Proselytes, (such I mean that are dispenced with for the reading of them,) for the direction of their Faith and Lives. And the same may be said of your Translations of the Bible into other national Languages, in respect of those that are Licensed to read them. This I presume you will confess. And moreover, that these Translations came not by inspiration, but were the productions of humane Industry; and that not Angels, but men were the Authors of them. Men I say, meer men, subject to the same Passions and to the same possibility of erring with our Translators. And then how does it not unavoidably follow, that in them which depend upon these Translations for their direction

rection, Faith, and Truth, and Salvation, and all relies upon fallible and uncertain grounds?

74. Tenthly and laſtly (to lay the Axe to the Root of the Tree,) the *Helena* which you ſo fight for, your vulgar Tranſlation, though ſome of you believe, or pretend to believe, it to be in every part and particle of it, the pure and uncorrupted Word of God; yet others among you, and thoſe as good and zealous Catholicks as you, are not ſo confident hereof.

75. Firſt, for all thoſe who have made Tranſlations of the whole Bible or any part of it different many times in ſenſe from the Vulgar, as *Lyranus, Cajetan, Pagnine, Arias, Eraſmus, Valla, Steuchus,* and others, it is apparent and even palpable, that they never dreamt of any abſolute perfecti on and authentical Infallibility of the *Vulgar Tranſlation.* For if they had, why did they in many places reject it and differ from it?

76. *Vega* was preſent at the Council of *Trent,* when that decree was made, which made the *Vulgar Edition* (then not extant any where in the World) *authentical,* and not to be rejected upon any pretence whatſoever. At the forming this decree *Vega* I ſay was preſent, underſtood the mind of the Council, as well as any man, and profeſſes that he was inſtructed in it by the *Preſident* of it, the *Cardinal* S. *Cruce.* And yet he hath written that *the Council in this decree, meant to pronounce this Tranſlation free* (not ſimply from all Error) *but only from ſuch Errors, out of which any opinion pernicious to Faith and Manners might be collected.* This, *Andradius* in his defence of that Council reports of *Vega,* and aſſents to it himſelf. *Driedo,* in his *Book of the Tranſlation of Holy Scripture,* hath theſe Words very pregnant and pertinent to the ſame purpoſe; *The See Apoſtolick, hath approved or accepted* Hieroms *Edition, not as ſo wholly conſonant to the Original, and ſo entire and pure and reſtored in all things, that it may not be lawful for any man, either by comparing it with the Fountain to examine it, or in ſome places to doubt, whether or no* Hierome *did underſtand the true ſenſe of the Scripture; but only as an Edition to be preferred before all others then extant, and*

and no where deviating from the Truth in the Rules of Faith and good Life. Mariana, even where he is a moſt earneſt Advocate for the Vulgar Edition, yet acknowleges the imperfection of it in theſe Words, *The faults of the Vulgar Edition are not approved by the Decree of the Council of* Trent, *a multitude whereof we did collect from the variety of Copies.* And again, *We maintain that the Hebrew and Greek, were by no means rejected by the* Trent *Fathers: And that the Latin Edition is indeed approved, yet not ſo, as if they did deny that ſome places might be Tranſlated more plainly, ſome more properly; whereof it were eaſie to produce innumerable examples.* And this he there profeſſes to have *learnt of* Laines *the then General of the Society:* who was a great part of that Council, preſent at all the Actions of it, and of very great authority in it. *Pro Edit. vulg.* c. 21. p. 99.

77. To this ſo great authority he adds a reaſon of his opinion, which with all indifferent men will be of a far greater authority. *If the Council* (ſaith he) *had purpoſed to approve an Edition in all reſpects, and to make it of equal authority and credit with the Fountains, certainly they ought with exact care firſt to have corrected the Errors of the Interpreter:* which certainly they did not.

78. Laſtly *Bellarmine* himſelf, though he will not acknowledge any imperfection in the Vulgar Edition, yet he acknowledges that the caſe may, and does oft-times ſo fall out, that *it is impoſſible to diſcern which is the true reading of the Vulgar Edition, but only by recourſe unto the Originals, and dependence upon them.* *Bell. de verbo Dei* l. 2. c. 11. p. 120.

79. From all which it may evidently be collected, that though ſome of you flatter your ſelves with a vain imagination of the certain abſolute purity and perfection of your Vulgar Edition; yet the matter is not ſo certain, and ſo reſolved, but that the beſt Learned men amongſt you are often at a ſtand, and very doubtful ſometimes whether your Vulgar Tranſlation be true, and ſometimes whether this or that be your Vulgar Tranſlation, and ſometimes undoubtedly reſolved that your Vulgar Tranſlation is no true Tranſlation, nor conſonant to the Original, as it was at firſt delivered. And what then can be

be alledged, but that out of your own grounds it may be inferred and inforced upon you, that not only in your Lay-men, but your Clergy-men and Scholars, Faith and Truth and Salvation and all depends upon fallible and uncertain grounds? And thus by Ten ſeveral retortions of this one Argument, I have endeavoured to ſhew you, how ill you have complied with your own advice, which was *to take heed of urging Arguments that might be returned upon you.* I ſhould now by a direct anſwer, ſhew that it preſſeth not us at all: but I have in paſſing done it already, in the end of the ſecond retortion of this Argument, and thither I refer the Reader.

80. Whereas therefore, you exhort them *that will have aſſurance of true Scriptures, to fly to your Church for it:* I deſire to know (if they ſhould follow your advice) how they ſhould be aſſured that your Church can give them any ſuch aſſurance; which hath been *confeſſedly* ſo negligent, as to ſuffer many *whole Books of Scripture* to be utterly loſt. Again, in thoſe that remain, confeſſedly ſo negligent, as to ſuffer *the Originals of theſe that remain to be corrupted.* And laſtly, ſo careleſs of preſerving the integrity of the Copies of her Tranſlation, as to ſuffer *infinite variety of Readings* to come in to them, without keeping *any one perfect Copy,* which might have been as the Standard, and *Polycletus* his Canon to correct the reſt by. So that which was the true reading, and which the falſe, it was utterly undiſcernable, but only by comparing them with the Originals, which alſo ſhe pretends *to be corrupted.*

84. Ad 17. §.] In this Diviſion you charge us *with great uncertainty, concerning the true meaning of Scripture.* Which hath been anſwered already, by ſaying, That if you ſpeak of plain places, (and in ſuch all things neceſſary are contained,) we are ſufficiently certain of the meaning of them, neither need they any Interpreter: If of obſcure and difficult places, we confeſs we are uncertain of the ſenſe of many of them. But then we ſay there is no neceſſity we ſhould be certain. For if Gods Will had been we ſhould have underſtood him more certainly, he would have ſpoken more plainly. And

we

we ſay beſides, that as we are uncertain, ſo are You too; which he that doubts of, let him read your Commentators upon the Bible, and obſerve their various and diſſonant Interpretations, and he ſhall in this point need no further ſatisfaction.

85. *Obj.* But ſeeing *there are contentions among us, we are taught by nature and Scripture, and experience* (ſo you tell us out of M. *Hooker*) *to ſeek for the ending of them, by ſubmiting unto ſome Judicical ſentence, whereunto neither part may refuſe to ſtand.*

Anſw. This is very true. Neither ſhould you need to perſuade us to ſeek ſuch a means of ending all our Controverſies, if we could tell where to find it. But this we know, that none is fit to pronounce, for all the World, a judicial definitive obliging Sentence in Controverſies of Religion, but only ſuch a Man, or ſuch a ſociety of Men, as is authorized thereto by God. And beſides we are able to demonſtrate, that it hath not been the pleaſure of God to give to any Man, or Society of Men any ſuch authority. And therefore though we wiſh heartily that all Controverſies were ended, as we do that all ſin were aboliſht, yet we have little hope of the one, or the other, till the World be ended. And in the mean while, think it beſt to content our ſelves with, and to perſuade others unto an *Unity of Charity and mutual Toleration*; ſeeing God hath authorized no man to force all men to *Unity of Opinion*. Neither do we think it fit to argue thus, To us it ſeems convenient there ſhould be one Judge of all Controverſies for the whole World, therefore God has appointed one: But more modeſt and more reaſonable to collect thus, God hath appointed no ſuch Judge of Controverſies, therefore, though it ſeems to us convenient there ſhould be one, yet it is not ſo: Or though it were convenient for us to have one, yet it hath pleaſed God (for Reaſons beſt known to himſelf) not to allow us this convenience.

87. Ad 18. §.] That the true Interpretation of the Scripture ought to be received from the Church, you need not prove, for it is very eaſily granted by them, who profeſs

profeſs themſelves very ready to receive all Truths, much more the true ſenſe of Scripture, not only from the Church, but from any Society of men, nay from any man whatſoever.

88. That the *Churches Interpretation of Scripture is always true*, that is it which you would have ſaid: and that in ſome ſenſe may be alſo admitted. *viz.* If you ſpeak of that Church (which before you ſpeak of in the 14. §.) that is, of the Church of all Ages ſince the Apoſtles. Upon the Tradition of which Church, you there told us, *We were to receive the Scripture, and to believe it to be the Word of God.* For there you teach us, that *our Faith of Scripture depends on a Principle which requires no other proof*, And that, *ſuch is Tradition, which from Hand to Hand, and Age to Age bring us up to the Times and Perſons of the Apoſtles and our Saviour himſelf, cometh to be confirmed by all thoſe Miracles, and other Arguments whereby they convinced their Doctrine to be true.* Wherefore the Ancient Fathers avouch that we muſt receive the Sacred Scripture upon the Tradition of this Church. The Tradition then of this Church you ſay muſt teach us what is Scripture: and we are willing to believe it. And now if you make it good unto us, that the ſame Tradition down from the Apoſtles, hath delivered from Age to Age, and from Hand to Hand, any Interpretation of any Scripture, we are ready to embrace that alſo. But now, if you will argue thus: The Church in one ſenſe, tells us what is Scripture, and we believe, therefore if the Church taken in another ſenſe, tell us, this or that is the meaning of the Scripture, we are to believe that alſo; this is too tranſparent Sophiſtry, to take any but thoſe that are willing to be taken.

89. If there be any Traditive Interpretation of Scripture, produce it, and prove it to be ſo; and we embrace it. But the Tradition of all Ages is one thing; and the authority of the preſent Church, much more of the *Roman Church*, which is but a Part, and a corrupted Part of the *Catholick Church*, is another. And therefore though we are ready to receive both Scripture and the

the ſenſe of Scripture upon the authority of *Original Tradition*, yet we receive neither the one, nor the other, upon the Authority of your Church.

90. Firſt for the Scripture, how can we receive them upon the Authority of your Church: who hold now thoſe Books to be Canonical, which formerly you rejected from the Canon? I inſtance, in the *Book of Macchabees*, and the *Epiſtle to the Hebrews*. The firſt of theſe you held not to be Canonical in S. *Gregories* time, or elſe he was no member of your Church, for it is apparent [a] He held otherwiſe. The ſecond you rejected from the Canon in S. *Hieroms* time, as it is evident out of [b] many places of his Works.

[a] See *Greg. Mor. l.* 19. *c.* 13.
[b] Thus he teſtifies. *Com. in Eſa. c.* 6. in theſe words. *Unde & Paulus Apoſt. in Epiſt. ad Heb. quam Latina conſuetudo non recipit:* and again in c. 8. in theſe, *In Ep. quæ ad Hebræos ſcribitur, (licet eam Latina Conſuetudo inter Canonicas Scripturas non recipiat.)* &c.

91. If you ſay (which is all you can) that *Hierom ſpake this of the particular* Roman Church, *not of the* Roman Catholick *Church*; I anſwer, there was none ſuch in his time, None that was called ſo. Secondly, what he ſpake of the *Roman Church*, muſt be true of all other Churches, if your Doctrine of the neceſſity of the Conformity of all other Churches to that Church were then Catholick Doctrine. Now then chooſe whether you will, either that the particular *Roman Church*, was not then believed to be the Miſtris of all other Churches (notwithſtanding, *Ad hanc Eccleſiam neceſſe eſt omnem convenire Eccleſiam, hoc eſt, omnes qui ſunt undique fideles*,; which Card. *Perron*, and his *Tranſlatreſs* ſo often tranſlates falſe:) Or if you ſay ſhe was, you will run into a greater inconvenience, and be forced to ſay, that all the Churches of that time, rejected from the Canon the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, together with the *Roman Church*. And conſequently that the *Catholick Church* may Err in rejecting from the Canon Scriptures truly Canonical.

92. Secondly, How can we receive the Scripture upon the authority of the *Roman Church*, which hath delivered at ſeveral times Scriptures in many places, different and repugnant, for Authentical and Canonical? which is moſt evident out of the place of *Malachy*, which is ſo quoted for the Sacrifice of the Maſs, that either all the Ancient Fathers had falſe Bibles, or yours is falſe.

Moſt evident likewiſe from the comparing of the ſtory of *Jacob* in *Geneſis*, with that which is cited out of it, in the *Epiſtle to the Hebrews*, according to the vulgar Edition. But above all, to any one, who ſhall compare the Bibles of *Sixtus* and *Clement*, ſo evident, that the wit of man cannot diſguiſe it.

93. Thus you ſee what reaſon we have to believe your Antecedent, *That your Church it is which muſt declare, what Books be true Scripture.* Now for the conſequence, that certainly is as liable to exception as the Antecedent. For if it were true, that God had promiſed to aſſiſt you, for the delivering of true Scripture, would this oblige him, or would it follow from hence that He had obliged himſelf, to teach you, not only ſufficiently, but *effectually* and *irriſiſtably* the true ſenſe of Scripture? God is not defective in things neceſſary: neither will he leave himſelf without witneſs, nor the World without means of knowing his will and doing it. And therefore it was neceſſary that by his Providence he ſhould preſerve the Scripture from any undiſcernable corruption, in thoſe things which he would have known: otherwiſe it is apparent, it had not been his will, that theſe things ſhould be known, the only means of continuing the knowledg of them being periſhed. But now neither is God laviſh in ſuperfluities, and therefore having given us means ſufficient for our direction, and power ſufficient to make uſe of theſe means, he will not conſtrain or neceſſitate us to make uſe of theſe means. For that were to croſs the end of our Creation, which was to be glorified by our free obedience: whereas neceſſity and freedom cannot ſtand together. That were to reverſe the Law which he hath preſcribed to himſelf in his dealing with men, and that is, *to ſet Life and Death before him, and to leave him in the hands of his own Counſel.* God gave the Wiſemen a Star to lead them to *Chriſt*, but he did not neceſſitate them to follow the guidance of this Star: that was left to their liberty. God gave the Children of *Iſrael a Fire to lead them by Night, and a Pillar of Cloud by Day*, but he conſtrained no man to follow them: that was left to their

their liberty. So he gives the Church, the Scripture: which in thoſe things which are to be believed or done, are plain and eaſie to be followed, like the Wiſemens Star. Now that which he deſires of us on our part, is the Obedience of Faith, and love of the Truth, and deſire to find the true ſenſe of it, and induſtry in ſearching it, and humility in following, and Conſtancy in profeſſing it: all which if he ſhould work in us by an abſolute irreſiſtible neceſſity, he could no more require of us, as our duty, than he can of the Sun to ſhine, of the Sea to Ebb and Flow, and of all other Creatures to do thoſe things which by meer neceſſity they muſt do, and cannot chooſe. Beſides, what an impudence is it to pretend that *your Church is infallibly directed concerning the true meaning of the Scripture,* whereas there are Thouſands of places of Scripture, which you do not pretend certainly to underſtand, and about the Interpretation whereof, your own Doctors differ among themſelves? If your Church be infallibly directed concerning the true meaning of Scripture, why do not your Doctors follow her infallible direction? And if they do, how comes ſuch difference among them in their Interpretations?

94. Again, why does your Church thus put her Candle under a Buſhel, and keep her Talent of interpreting Scripture infallibly, thus long wrapt up in Napkins? Why ſets ſhe not forth Infallible Commentaries or Expoſitions upon all the Bible? Is it becauſe this would not be profitable for Chriſtians, that Scripture ſhould be Interpreted? Is it blaſphemous to ſay ſo. The Scripture it ſelf tells us, *All Scripture is profitable.* And the Scripture is not ſo much the Words as the Senſe. And if it be not profitable, why does ſhe imploy particular Doctors to interpret Scriptures fallibly? unleſs we muſt think that fallible Interpretations of Scripture are profitable, and infallible Interpretations would not be ſo?

95. If you ſay *the Holy Ghoſt, which aſſiſts the Church in interpreting, will move the Church to interpret when he ſhall think fit, and that the Church will do it when the Holy Ghoſt ſhall move her to do it:* I demand whether the Ho-

ly Ghoſts moving of the Church to ſuch works as theſe be reſiſtible by the Church, or irreſiſtible. If reſiſtible, then the Holy Ghoſt may move, and the Church may not be moved. As certainly the Holy Ghoſt doth always move to an Action, when he ſhews us plainly that it would be for the good of men, and Honour of God. As he that hath any ſenſe will acknowledge that an infallible expoſition of Scripture could not but be, and there is no conceivable reaſon, why ſuch a work ſhould be put off a day, but only becauſe you are conſcious to your ſelves, you cannot do it, and therefore make excuſes. But if the moving of the Holy Ghoſt be irreſiſtible, and you are not yet ſo moved to go about this work; then I confeſs you are excuſed. But then I would know, whether thoſe *Popes* which ſo long deferred the calling of a Council for the Reformation of your Church, at length pretended to be effected by the Council of *Trent*, whether they may excuſe themſelves, for that they were not moved by the Holy Ghoſt to do it? I would know likewiſe, as this motion is irreſiſtible when it comes, ſo whether it be ſo ſimply neceſſary to the moving of your Church to any ſuch publick Action, that it cannot poſſibly move without it? That is, whether the *Pope* now could not, if he would, ſeat himſelf *in Cathedra*, and fall to writing expoſitions upon the Bible for the directions of Chriſtians to the true ſenſe of it? If you ſay he cannot, you will make your ſelf ridiculous. If he can, then I would know, whether he ſhould be infallibly directed in theſe expoſitions, or no? If he ſhould, then what need he to ſtay for irreſiſtible motion? Why does he not go about this noble work preſently? If he ſhould not, How ſhall we know that the calling of the Council of *Trent* was not upon his own voluntary motion, or upon humane importunity and ſuggeſtion, and not upon the motion of the Holy Ghoſt? And conſequently how ſhall we know whether he were aſſiſtant to it or no, ſeeing he aſſiſts none but what he himſelf moves to? And whether he did move the *Pope* to call this Council, is a ſecret thing, which we cannot poſſibly know, nor perhaps the *Pope* himſelf.

96. If

96. If you ſay, your meaning is only, *That the Church ſhall be infallibly guarded from giving any falſe ſenſe of any Scripture, and not infallibly aſſiſted poſitively to give the true ſenſe of all Scripture:* I put to you your own Queſtion, why ſhould we believe the Holy Ghoſt will ſtay there? Or, why may we not as well think he will ſtay at the firſt thing, that is, in teaching the Church what Books be true Scripture? For if the Holy Ghoſts aſſiſtance be promiſed to all things profitable, then will he be with them infallibly, not only to guard them from all Errors, but to guide them to all profitable truths, ſuch as the true ſenſes of all Scripture would be. Neither could he ſtay there, but defend them irreſiſtibly from all Vices; Nor there neither, but infuſe into them irreſiſtibly all Vertues: for all theſe things would be much for the benefit of Chriſtians. If you ſay, he cannot do this without taking away their free-will in living; I ſay neither can he neceſſitate men to believe aright, without taking away their free-will in believing and in profeſſing their belief.

97. *Obj.* To the place of S. *Auſtin, (I would not believe the Goſpel, unleſs the Authority of the Church did move me.* Contr. ep. Fund. c. 5.*)*

Anſw. I anſwer, That not the Authority of the preſent Church, much leſs of a Part of it (as the *Roman Church* is) was that which alone moved Saint *Auſtin* to believe the Goſpel, but the perpetual Tradition of the Church of all Ages. Which you your ſelf have taught us to be the *only Principle by which the Scripture is proved, and which it ſelf needs no proof*; and to which you have referred this very ſaying of S. *Auſtin, Ego vero Evangelio non crederem niſi, &c. p.* 55. And in the next place which you cite out of his Book *De Util. Cred. c.* 14. he ſhews, that his *motives to believe, were, Fame, Celebrity, Conſent, Antiquity.* And ſeeing this Tradition, this Conſent, this Antiquity did as fully and powerfully move him not to believe *Manichæus*, as to believe the Goſpel, (the Chriſtian Tradition being as full againſt *Manichæus* as it was for the Goſpel) therefore he did well to conclude upon theſe grounds,

grounds, that he had as much reaſon to disbelieve *Manichæus*, as to believe the Goſpel. Now if you can truly ſay, that the ſame Fame, Celebrity, Conſent, Antiquity, that the ſame Univerſal and Original Tradition, lies againſt *Luther* and *Calvin*, as did againſt *Manichæus*, you may do well to apply the Argument againſt them; otherwiſe it will be to little purpoſe to ſubſtitute their names inſtead of *Manichæus*, unleſs you can ſhew the things agrees to them as well as him.

98. If you ſay, that S. *Auſtin ſpeaks here of the Authority of the Preſent Church, abſtracting from conſent with the Ancient*, and therefore you, ſeeing you have the preſent Church on your ſide againſt *Luther* and *Calvin*, as S. *Auſtin* againſt *Manichæus*, may urge the ſame words againſt them which S. *Auſtin* did againſt him;

99. I anſwer, Firſt that it is a vain preſumption of yours that the *Catholick Church is of your ſide*. Secondly, that if S. *Auſtin* ſpeak here of that preſent Church, which moved him to believe the Goſpel, without conſideration of the Antiquity of it, and its both Perſonal and Doctrinal ſucceſſion from the Apoſtles; His Argument will be like a *Buskin* that will ſerve any leg. It will ſerve to keep an *Arrian*, or a *Grecian* from being a *Roman Catholick*, as well as a Catholick from being an *Arrian*, or a *Grecian?* In as much as the *Arrians* and *Grecians*, did pretend to the Title of Catholicks, and the Church, as much as the *Papiſts* now do. If then you ſhould have come to an Ancient *Goth* or *Vandal*, whom the *Arrians* converted to Chriſtianity, and ſhould have moved him to your Religion; might he not ſay the very ſame words to you as S. *Auſtin* to the *Manichæans? I would not believe the Goſpel, unleſs the Authority of the Church did move me. Them therefore whom I obeyed, ſaying believe the Goſpel, why ſhould I not obey ſaying to me, do not believe the* Homoouſians? *Chooſe what thou pleaſeſt: If thou ſhalt ſay believe the* Arrians, *they warn me not to give any Credit to you. If therefore I believe them, I cannot believe thee. If thou ſay do not believe the* Arrians, *thou ſhalt not do well to force me to the Faith of the* Homoouſians, *becauſe by the Preaching of the* Arrians

I believed the Goſpel it ſelf. If you ſay, you did well to believe them, commending the Goſpel, but you did not well to believe them diſcommending the Homoouſians: *Doeſt thou think me ſo very fooliſh, that without any reaſon at all, I ſhould believe what thou wilt, and not believe what thou wilt not?* It were eaſie to put theſe words into the mouth of a *Grecian, Abyſſine, Georgian,* or any other of any Religion. And I pray bethink your ſelves, what you would ſay to ſuch a one in ſuch a caſe, and imagine that we ſay the very ſame to you.

101. And whereas you ſay, S. *Auſtin may ſeem to have ſpoken Prophetically againſt* Proteſtants, *when he ſaid, Why ſhould I not moſt diligently inquire, what Chriſt commanded, of them before all others, by whoſe Authority I was moved to believe, that Chriſt Commanded any good thing?*

Anſw. I anſwer, Until you can ſhew that *Proteſtants* believe that Chriſt commanded any good thing, that is, That they believe the truth of Chriſtian Religion upon the Authority of the Church of *Rome,* this place muſt be wholly impertinent to your purpoſe; which is to make *Proteſtants* believe your Church to be the infallible expounder of Scriptures and judge of Controverſies: nay rather is it not directly againſt your purpoſe? For why may not a member of the Church of *England,* who received his Baptiſm, Education and Faith from the Miniſtry of this Church, ſay juſt ſo to you as S. *Auſtin* here to the *Manichees*? Why ſhould I not moſt diligently inquire, what Chriſt commanded, of them (the Church of *England*) before all others, by whoſe authority I was moved to believe, that Chriſt commanded any good thing, Can you, *F.* or *K.* or whoſoever you are, better declare to me what he ſaid, whom I would not have thought to have been or to be, if the belief thereof had been recommended by you to me? This therefore (that *Chriſt Jeſus* did thoſe miracles, and taught that Doctrine which is contained evidently in the undoubted Books of the *New Teſtament*) I believed by Fame, ſtrengthened with Celebrity and Conſent, (even of thoſe which in other things are at infinite variance one with another,) and laſtly by Antiquity (which gives an Univerſal and a conſtant atteſtation to them) But every

every one may ſee that you, ſo few (in compariſon of all thoſe upon whoſe conſent we ground our belief of Scripture,) ſo turbulent, (that you damn all to the Fire, and to Hell, that any way differ from you; that you profeſs it is lawful for you, to uſe violence and power whenſoever you can have it, for the planting of your own Doctrine, and the extirpation of the contrary;) laſtly ſo new in many of your Doctrines, (as in the lawfulneſs, and expedience of debarring the Laity the Sacramental Cup; the lawfulneſs and expedience of your Latine Service, Tranſubſtantiation, Indulgences, Purgatory, the *Popes* infallibility, his Authority over Kings, *&c*) ſo new I ſay, in compariſon of the undoubted Books of Scripture, which evidently containeth, or rather is our Religion, and the ſole, and adequate object of our Faith: I ſay every one may ſee that you, ſo few, ſo turbulent, ſo new, can produce nothing deſerving authority (with wiſe and conſiderate men) What madneſs is this? Believe them the conſent of Chriſtians which are now, and have been ever ſince Chriſt in the World, that we ought to believe Chriſt; but learn of us what Chriſt ſaid, which contradict and damn all other parts of Chriſtendom. Why I beſeech you? Surely if they were not at all, and could not teach me any thing, I would more eaſily perſuade my ſelf, that I were not to believe in Chriſt, than that I ſhould learn any thing concerning him, from any other, than them by whom I believed him: at leaſt, than that I ſhould learn what his Religion was from you, who have wronged ſo exceedingly his Miracles and his Doctrine, by forging ſo evidently ſo many falſe Miracles for the Confirmation of your new Doctrine; which might give us juſt occaſion, had we no other aſſurance of them but your Authority, to ſuſpect the true ones. Who with forging ſo many falſe Stories, and falſe Authors, have taken a fair way to make the Faith of all Stories queſtionable; if we had no other ground for our belief of them but your Authority: who have brought in Doctrines plainly and directly contrary to that which you confeſs to be the Word of Chriſt, and which, for the moſt part, make either for the honour

or

or profit of the Teachers of them: which (if there were no difference between the Chriſtian and the *Roman* Church) would be very apt to make ſuſpicious men believe that Chriſtian Religion was a humane invention, taught by ſome cunning Impoſtors, only to make themſelves rich and powerful; who make a profeſſion of corrupting all ſorts of Authors: a ready courſe to make it juſtly queſtionable whether any remain uncorrupted. For if you take this Authority upon you, upon the ſix Ages laſt paſt; how ſhall we know, that the Church of that time, did not Uſurp the ſame Authority upon the Authors of the ſix laſt Ages before them, and ſo upwards until we come to Chriſt himſelf? Whoſe queſtioned Doctrines, none of them came from the Fountain of Apoſtolick Tradition, but have inſinuated themſelves into the Streams, by little and little, ſome in one Age, and ſome in another, ſome more Anciently, ſome more lately, and ſome yet are Embrio's, yet hatching, and in the Shell; as the *Popes* Infallibility, the Bleſſed Virgins immaculate conception, the *Popes* power over the Temporalities of Kings, the Doctrine of Predetermination, *&c.* all which yet are, or in time may be impoſed upon Chriſtians under the Title of *Original and Apoſtolick Tradition*; and that with that neceſſity, that they are told, they were as good believe nothing at all, as not believe theſe things to have come from the Apoſtles, which they know to have been brought in but yeſterday: which whether it be not a ready and likely way to make men conclude thus with themſelves--- I am told, that I were as good believe nothing at all, as believe ſome points which the Church teaches me, and not others: and ſome things which ſhe teaches to be Ancient and Certain, I plainly ſee to be New and Falſe, therefore I will believe nothing at all. Whether I ſay the foreſaid grounds be not a ready and likely way to make men conclude thus, and whether this concluſion be not too often made in *Italy*, and *Spain*, and *France*, and in *England* too, I leave it to the judgment of thoſe that have Wiſdom and Experience. Seeing therefore the *Roman Church* is ſo far from being a ſuffici-

ent Foundation for our belief in Chriſt, that it is in ſundry regards a dangerous temptation againſt it; why ſhould I not much rather conclude, Seeing we receive not the knowledg of Chriſt and Scriptures from the Church of *Rome*, neither from her muſt we take his Doctrine, or the Interpretation of Scripture?

102. Ad §. 19. In this number, this Argument is contained. *The Judge of Controverſies ought to be intelligible to learned and unlearned; The Scripture is not ſo, and the Church is ſo; Therefore the Church is the Judge, and not the Scripture.*

103. To this I anſwer: As to be underſtandible is a condition requiſite to a Judge, ſo is not that alone ſufficient to make a Judge; otherwiſe you might make your ſelf Judge of Controverſies, by arguing; The Scripture is not intelligible by all, but I am, therefore I am Judge of Controverſies. If you ſay your intent was to conclude againſt the Scripture, and not for the Church: I demand why then, but to delude the ſimple with Sopiſtry, did you ſay in the cloſe of this §. *Such is the Church, and the Scripture is not ſuch?* but that you would leave it to them to infer in the end, (which indeed was more than you undertook in the beginning) *Therefore the Church is Judge and the Scripture not.* I ſay Secondly; that you ſtill run upon a falſe ſuppoſition: that God hath appointed ſome Judge of all Controverſies that may happen among Chriſtians, about the ſenſe of obſcure Texts of Scripture: whereas he has left every one to his liberty herein, in thoſe words of S. *Paul, Quiſque abundet in ſenſu ſuo*, &c. I ſay Thirdly. Whereas ſome *Proteſtants* make the Scripture Judge of Controverſies, that they have the Authority of Fathers to warrant their manner of ſpeaking: as of * *Optatus.*

* *Contra Parmen. l. 5. in Prin.*

104. But ſpeaking truly and properly the Scripture is not a Judge nor cannot be, but only, a *ſufficient Rule*, for thoſe to judge by, that believe it to be the word of God (as the Church of *England* and the Church of *Rome* both do,) what they are to believe, and what they are not to believe. I ſay ſufficiently perfect, and ſufficiently intelligible in things neceſſary, to all that have underſtanding, whether

whether they be learned or unlearned. And my reaſon hereof is convincing and demonſtrative; becauſe nothing is neceſſary to be believed, but what is plainly revealed. For to ſay, that when a place of Scripture, by reaſon of ambiguous terms, lies indifferent between divers ſenſes, whereof one is true, and the other is falſe, that God obliges men under pain of damnation, not to miſtake through error and humane frailty, is to make God a Tyrant, and to ſay that he requires us certainly to attain that end, for the attaining whereof we have no certain means; which is to ſay, that, like *Pharaoh*, he gives no ſtraw, and requires brick; that he reaps where he ſows not; that he gathers where he ſtrews not, that he will not be pleaſed with our utmoſt endeavors to pleaſe him, without full and exact and never failing performance; that his will is we ſhould do what he knows we cannot do; that he will not accept of us according to that which we have, but requireth of us what we have not. Which whether it can conſiſt with his goodneſs, with his wiſdom, and with his word, I leave it to honeſt men to judge. If I ſhould ſend a Servant to *Paris*, or *Rome*, or *Jeruſalem*, and he uſing his utmoſt diligence not to miſtake his way, yet notwithſtanding, meeting often with ſuch places where the road is divided into ſeveral ways, whereof every one is as likely to be true, and as likely to be falſe as any other, ſhould at length miſtake and go out of the way; would not any man ſay that I were an impotent, fooliſh and unjuſt Maſter, if I ſhould be offended with him for doing ſo? And ſhall we not tremble to impute that to God, which we would take in foul ſcorn, if it were imputed to our ſelves? Certainly, I for my part fear I ſhould not love God if I ſhould think ſo ſtrangely of him.

105. Again, When you ſay, *that unlearned, and ignorant men cannot underſtand Scripture*, I would deſire you to come out of the Clouds, and tell us what you mean: Whether, that they cannot underſtand all Scripture, or that they cannot underſtand any Scripture, or that they cannot underſtand ſo much as is ſufficient for their direction to Heaven. If the firſt; I believe the Learned are in the

ſame Caſe. If the Second; every mans experience will confute you: for who is there that is not capable of a ſufficient underſtanding of the Story, the Precepts, the Promiſes, and the Threats of the Goſpel? If the Third; that they may underſtand ſomething, but not enough for their Salvations; I ask you, firſt. Why then doth Saint *Paul* ſay to *Timothy, The Scriptures are able to make him wiſe unto Salvation?* Why does Saint *Auſtin* ſay, *Ea quæ manifeſtè poſita ſunt in ſacris Scripturis, omnia continent quæ pertinent ad Fidem Moreſque vivendi?* Why does every one of the four *Evangeliſts* Intitle their Book *The Goſpel*, if any neceſſary and eſſential part of the Goſpel were left out of it? Can we imagine, that either they omitted ſomething neceſſary, out of ignorance not knowing it to be neceſſary? Or knowing it to be ſo, malicioufly concealed it? Or out of negligence, did the work they had undertaken by halfes? If none of theſe things can without Blaſphemy be imputed to them, conſidering they were aſſiſted by the Holy Ghoſt in this work, then certainly it moſt evidently follows, that every one of them writ the whole Goſpel of Chriſt; I mean all the eſſential and neceſſary parts of it. So that if we had no other Book of Scripture, but one of them alone, we ſhould not want any thing neceſſary to Salvation. And what one of them has more than another, it is only profitable, and not neceſſary. Neceſſary indeed to be believed, becauſe revealed; but not therefore revealed, becauſe neceſſary to be believed.

106. Neither did they write only for the Learned, but for all men. This being one eſpecial means of the Preaching of the Goſpel, which was commanded to be Preached, not only to Learned men but *to all men.* And therefore, unleſs we will imagine the Holy Ghoſt and them to have been wilfully wanting to their own deſire and purpoſe, we muſt conceive, that they intended to ſpeak plain, even to the capacity of the ſimpleſt; at leaſt touching all things neceſſary to be publiſhed by them, and believed by us.

107. And

107. And whereas you pretend it *is ſo eaſie, and obvious both for the Learned and the ignorant, both to know which is the Church, and what are the Decrees of the Church, and what is the ſenſe of thoſe Decrees*: I ſay, this is a vain pretence.

108. For Firſt; How ſhall an unlearned man whom you have ſuppoſed now ignorant of Scripture, how ſhall he know which of all the Societies of Chriſtians is indeed the Church? You will ſay perhaps, *he muſt examine them by the notes of the Church, which are perpetual Viſibility, Succeſſion, Conformity with the ancient Church*, &c. But how ſhall he know, firſt, that theſe are the notes of the Church, unleſs by Scripture, which you ſay he underſtands not? You may ſay perhaps, he may be told ſo. But ſeeing men may deceive, and be deceived, and their words are no demonſtrations, how ſhall he be aſſured that what they ſay is true? So that at the firſt he meets with an impregnable difficulty, and cannot know the Church but by ſuch notes, which whether they be the notes of the Church he cannot poſſibly know. But let us ſuppoſe this *Iſthmus* digged through, and that he is aſſured theſe are the notes of the true Church: How can he poſſibly be a competent Judge, which Society of Chriſtians hath Title to theſe notes, and which hath not? Seeing this Trial of neceſſity requires a great ſufficiency of knowledge of the monuments of Chriſtian Antiquity, which no unlearned can have, becauſe he that hath it cannot be unlearned. As for example, how ſhall he poſſibly be able to know whether the Church of *Rome* hath had a perpetual Succeſſion of Viſible Profeſſors, which held always the ſame Doctrine which they now hold, without holding any thing to the contrary; unleſs he hath firſt examined, what was the Doctrine of the Church in the firſt Age, what in the ſecond, and ſo forth? And whether this be not a more difficult work, than to ſtay at the firſt Age, and to examine the Church by the conformity of her Doctrine, with the Doctrine of the firſt Age, every man of ordinary underſtanding may Judge.

Let

Let us imagine him advanced a ſtep farther, and to know which is the Church: how ſhall he know what that Church hath Decreed, ſeeing the Church hath not been ſo careful in keeping of her Decrees, but that many are loſt, and many corrupted? Beſides, when even the Learned among you are not agreed concerning divers things, whether they be *De Fide* or not; how ſhall the unlearned do? Then for the ſenſe of the Decrees, how can he be more capable of the underſtanding of them, then of plain Texts of Scripture, which you will not ſuffer him to underſtand? Eſpecially, ſeeing the Decrees of divers *Popes* and Councils are conceived ſo obſcurely, that the Learned cannot agree about the ſenſe of them. And then they are written all in ſuch Languages which the ignorant underſtand not, and therefore muſt of neceſſity rely herein upon the uncertain and fallible authority of ſome particular men, who inform them that there is ſuch a Decree. And if the Decrees were Tranſlated into Vulgar Languages, why the Tranſlators ſhould not be as fallible as you ſay the Tranſlators of Scripture are, who can poſſibly imagine?

109. Laſtly, how ſhall an unlearned man, or indeed any man, be aſſured of the certainty of that Decree, the certainty whereof depends upon ſuppoſitions which are impoſſible to be known whether they be true or no? For it is not the Decree of a Council, unleſs it be confirmed by a true *Pope*. Now the *Pope* cannot be a true *Pope* if he came in by Simony: which whether he did or no, who can anſwer me? He cannot be a true *Pope* unleſs he were Baptized, and Baptized he was not, unleſs the Miniſter had due Intention. So likewiſe he cannot be a true *Pope*, unleſs he were rightly ordained Prieſt, and that again depends upon the Ordainers ſecret Intention, and alſo upon his having the Epiſcopal Character. All which things, as I have formerly proved, depend upon ſo many uncertain ſuppoſitions, that no humane judgment can poſſibly be reſolved in them. I conclude therefore, that not the learneſt man amongſt you all, no not the *Pope* himſelf, can, according to the grounds you go upon, have any certainty,

certainty, that any Decree of any Council is good and valid, and conſequently, not any aſſurance that it is indeed the Decree of a Council.

110. Ad §. 20.] C. M. *By referring Controverſies to Scripture alone, all is finally reduced to the internal private Spirit.*

CHIL. If by a *private Spirit*, you mean, a particular perſuaſion that a Doctrine is true, which ſome men pretend, but cannot prove to come from the Spirit of God: I ſay, to refer Controverſies to the Scripture, is not to refer them to this kind of private Spirit. For is there not a manifeſt difference between ſaying, *the Spirit of God tells me that this is the meaning of ſuch a Text* (which no man can poſſibly know to be true, it being a ſecret thing) and between ſaying, *theſe and theſe Reaſons I have to ſhew, that this or that is true Doctrine, or that this or that is the meaning of ſuch a Scripture?* Reaſon being a publick and certain thing and expoſed to all mens Trial and Examination. But now if by *private Spirit* you underſtand every Mans particular Reaſon, then your firſt and ſecond inconvenience will preſently be reduced to one, and ſhortly to none at all.

111. Ad §. 21.] C. M. *By taking the Office of Judicature from the Church, it is Conferred upon every particular Man.*

CHIL. And does not alſo giving the Office of Judicature to the Church, come to confer it upon every particular Man? For before any man believes the Church Infallible, muſt he not have reaſon to induce him to believe it to be ſo? and muſt he not judge of thoſe reaſons, whether they be indeed good and firm, or Captious and Sophiſtical? Or would you have all men believe all your Doctrine upon the Churches Infallibility, and the Churches Infallibility they know not why?

112. Secondly, ſuppoſing they are to be guided by the Church, they muſt uſe their own particular reaſon to find out which is the Church. And to that purpoſe you your ſelves give a great many Notes, which you pretend firſt to be Certain Notes of the Church, and then to be peculiar to your Church, and agreeable to none elſe; but

but you do not ſo much as pretend, that either of thoſe pretences is evident of it ſelf, and therefore you go about to prove them both by reaſons; and thoſe reaſons I hope every particular man is to judge of, whether they do indeed conclude and convince that which they are alledged for: that is, that theſe marks are indeed certain Notes of the Church, and then that your Church hath them, and no other.

113. One of theſe Notes, indeed the only Note of a true and uncorrupted Church, is conformity with Antiquity; I mean the moſt Ancient Church of all, that is the Primitive and Apoſtolick. Now how is it poſſible any man ſhould examine your Church by this Note, but he muſt by his own particular judgment, find out what was the Doctrine of the Primitive Church, and what is the Doctrine of the preſent Church, and be able to anſwer all theſe Arguments which are brought to prove repugnance between them? otherwiſe he ſhall but pretend to make uſe of this Note for the finding the true Church, but indeed make no uſe of it, but receive the Church at a venture, as the moſt of you do; not one in a Hundred being able to give any tolerable reaſon for it. So that inſtead of reducing Men to particular reaſon, you reduce them to none at all, but to chance and paſſion, and prejudice and ſuch other ways, which if they lead one to the Truth, they lead Hundreds, nay Thouſands to Falſhood. But it is a pretty thing to conſider, how theſe men can blow Hot and Cold out of the ſame mouth to ſerve ſeveral purpoſes. Is there hope of gaining a Proſelyte? Then they will tell you, God hath given every every man Reaſon to follow; and if the Blind lead the Blind, both ſhall fall into the Ditch. That it is no good reaſon for a mans Religion, that he was Born and brought up in it: For then a *Turk* ſhould have as much reaſon to be a *Turk*, as a Chriſtian to be a Chriſtian. That every man hath a judgment of Diſcretion; which if they will make uſe of, they ſhall eaſily find: that the true Church hath always ſuch and ſuch marks, and that their Church has them, and no other but theirs. But then

then if any of theirs be perſuaded to a ſincere and ſufficient Trial of their Church, even by their own Notes of it, and to try whether they be indeed ſo conformable to Antiquity as they pretend, then their Note is changed: you muſt not uſe your own reaſon nor your judgment, but refer all to the Church, and believe her to be conformable to Antiquity, though they have no reaſon for it, nay though they have evident reaſon to the contrary. For my part I am certain that God hath given us our Reaſon to diſcern between Truth and Falſhood, and he that makes not this uſe of it, but believes things he knows not why, I ſay it is by chance that he believes the Truth, and not by choice: and that I cannot but fear, that God will not accept of this *Sacrifice of Fools.*

114. But you that would not have men follow their Reaſon, what would you have them to follow? their Paſſion? Or pluck out their eyes and go blindfold? *No,* you ſay *you would have them follow Authority.* On Gods name let them; we alſo would have them follow Authority; for it is upon the Authority of Univerſal Tradition, that we would have them believe Scripture. But then as for the Authority which you would have them follow, you will let them ſee reaſon why they ſhould follow it. And is not this to go a little about? to leave reaſon for a ſhort turn, and then to come to it again, and to do that which you condemn in others? It being indeed a plain impoſſibility for any man to ſubmit his reaſon but to reaſon: for he that does it to Authority, muſt of neceſſity think himſelf to have greater reaſon to believe that Authority. Therefore the confeſſion cited by *Brerely,* you need not think to have been extorted from *Luther* and the reſt. It came very freely from them, and what they ſay, you practiſe as much as they.

115. And whereas you ſay that a *Proteſtant admits of Fathers, Councils, Church, as far as they agree with Scripture, which upon the matter is himſelf:* I ſay you admit neither of them, nor the Scripture it ſelf, but only ſo far as it agrees with your Church: and your Church you admit becauſe you think you have reaſon to do ſo:

ſo that by you as well as by *Proteſtants* all is finally reſolved into your own reaſon.

116. Nor do *Hereticks* only but *Romiſh Catholicks* alſo ſet up as many Judges, as there are Men and Women in the Chriſtian World. For do not your Men and Women Judge your Religion to be true, before they believe it, as well as the Men and Women of other Religions? Oh but you ſay, *They receive it not becauſe they think it agreeable to Scripture, but becauſe the Church tells them ſo.* But then I hope they believe the Church becauſe their own reaſon tells them they are to do ſo. So that the difference between a *Papiſt* and a *Proteſtant* is this, not that the one judges and the other does not judge, but that the one judges his guide to be infallible, the other his way to be manifeſt. *This ſame pernitious Doctrine is taught by* Brentius, Zanchius, Cartwright, *and others.* It is ſo in very deed: But it is taught alſo by ſome others, whom you little think of. It is taught by S. *Paul*, where he ſays, *Try all things, hold faſt that which is good.* It is taught by S. *John*, in theſe words, *Believe not every Spirit, but try the Spirits whether they be of God or no.* It is taught by S. *Peter*, in theſe, *Be ye ready to render a reaſon of the hope that is in you.* Laſtly, this very pernitious Doctrine is taught by our *Saviour*, in theſe words, *If the Blind lead the Blind, both ſhall fall into the Ditch.* And *why of your ſelves Judge you not what is right?* All which ſpeeches, if they do not adviſe men to make uſe of their Reaſon for the choice of their Religion, I muſt confeſs my ſelf to underſtand nothing. Laſtly, not to be infinite, it is taught by M. *Knot* himſelf, not in one Page only, or Chapter of his *Book*, but all his Book over; the very writing and publiſhing whereof, ſuppoſeth this for certain, that the Readers are to be Judges, whether his Reaſons which he brings, be ſtrong and convincing; of which ſort we have hitherto met with none: or elſe captious, or impertinences, as indifferent men ſhall (as I ſuppoſe) have cauſe to judge them.

117. But you demand, *What good Stateſmen would they be, who ſhould ideate, or fancy ſuch a Commonwealth, as theſe men have*

have framed to themſelves a Church? Truly if this be all the fault they have, that they ſay. *Every man is to uſe his own judgment in the choice of his Religion, and not to believe this or that ſenſe of Scripture, upon the bare Authority of any Learned man or men, when he conceives he has reaſons to the contrary, which are of more weight than their Authority:* I know no reaſon, but notwithſtanding all this, they might be as good Stateſmen as any of the Society. But what has this to do with Common-wealths, where men are bound only to external obedience, unto the Laws and Judgments of Courts, but not to an internal approbation of them, no nor to conceal their Judgment of them, if they diſapprove them? As if I conceived I had reaſon to miſlike the Law of puniſhing ſimple Theft with Death, as Sir *Thomas Moore* did, I might profeſs lawfully my judgment, and repreſent my reaſons to the King or Common-wealth in a Parliament, as Sir *Thomas Moore* did, without committing any fault, or fearing any puniſhment.

118. To that place of S. *Auſtin* you cite (lib. 32. *cont. Fauſt. You ſee that you go about to overthrow all Authority of Scripture, and that every mans mind may be to himſelf a Rule, what he is to allow or diſallow in every Scripture:)* I ſhall need give no other Reply, but only to deſire you to ſpeak like an honeſt man, and to ſay, whether it be all one for a man, *to allow and diſallow in every Scripture what he pleaſes,* which is, either to daſh out of Scripture ſuch Texts or ſuch Chapters, becauſe they croſs his opinion? or to ſay (which is worſe,) *Though they be Scripture they are not true?* Whether, I ſay, for a man thus to allow and diſallow in Scripture what he pleaſes, be all one, and no greater fault, than to allow that ſenſe of Scripture which he conceives to be true and genuine, and deduced out of the words, and to diſallow the contrary? for Gods ſake, Sir, tell me plainly; In thoſe Texts of Scripture, which you alledge for the infallibility of your Church, do not you allow what ſenſe you think true, and diſallow the contrary? And do you not this by the direction of your private reaſon? If you do, why do you condemn it in others? If you do not, I pray you tell me what direction you follow? or whether you

follow none at all? If none at all, this is like drawing Lots, or throwing the Dice for the choice of a Religion. If any other: I beſeech you tell me what it is. Perhaps you will ſay, *the Churches Authority*; and that will be to dance finely in a round, thus, To believe the Churches Infallible Authority, becauſe the Scriptures avouch it; and to believe that Scriptures ſay and mean ſo, becauſe they are ſo expounded by the Church. Is not this for a Father to beget his Son, and the Son to beget his Father? For a foundation to ſupport the houſe, and the houſe to ſupport the foundation? Would not *Campian* have cryed out at it, *Ecce quos gyros, quos Mæandros?* And to what end was this going about, when you might as well at firſt have concluded the Church infallible becauſe ſhe ſays ſo; as thus to put in Scripture for a meer ſtale, and to ſay, the Church is infallible becauſe the Scripture ſays ſo, and the Scripture means ſo becauſe the Church ſays ſo, which is infallible? Is it not moſt evident therefore to every intelligent man, that you are enforced of neceſſity to do that your ſelf, which ſo Tragically you declaim againſt in others? The Church, you ſay, is Infallible; I am very doubtful of it: How ſhall I know it? The Scripture you ſay affirms it, as in the 59. of *Eſau, My ſpirit that is in thee, &c.* Well I confeſs I find there theſe words: but I am ſtill doubtful, whether they be ſpoken of the Church of Chriſt: and if they be, whether they mean as you pretend. You ſay, the Church ſays ſo, which is infallible. Yea but that is the Queſtion, and therefore not to be begged but proved. Neither is it ſo evident as to need no proof: otherwiſe why brought you this Text to prove it? Nor is it of ſuch a ſtrange quality, above all other Propoſitions, as to be able to prove it ſelf. What then remains but that you ſay, Reaſons drawn out of the Circumſtances of the Text, will evince that this is the ſenſe of it. Perhaps they will. But Reaſons cannot convince me, unleſs I judge of them by my Reaſon; and for every man or woman to relie on that, in the choice of their Religion, and in the interpreting of Scripture, you ſay is a horrible abſurdity; and therefore muſt neither make uſe of your own in this matter, nor deſire me to make uſe of it.

119. But *Univerſal Tradition* (you ſay, and ſo do I too,) *is of it ſelf credible: and that has in all Ages taught the Churches Infallibility with full conſent.* If it have, I am ready to believe it. But that it has I hope you would not have me take upon your word: for that were to build my ſelf upon the Church, and the Church upon You. Let then the Tradition appear; for a ſecret Tradition is ſomewhat like a ſilent Thunder. You will perhaps produce, for the confirmation of it, ſome ſayings of ſome Fathers, who in every Age taught this Doctrine; (as *Gualterius* in his Chronology undertakes to do, but with ſo ill ſucceſs, that I heard an able Man of your Religion profeſs, that *in the firſt three Centuries, there was not one Authority pertinent*:) but how will you warrant that none of them teach the contrary? Again, how ſhall I be aſſured that the places have indeed this ſenſe in them? Seeing there is not one Father for 500 years after Chriſt, that does ſay in plain terms, *The Church of* Rome *is Infallible.* What, ſhall we believe your Church that this is their meaning? But this will be again to go into the Circle, which made us giddy before; To prove the Church Infallible becauſe Tradition ſays ſo, Tradition to ſay ſo, becauſe the Fathers ſay ſo, The Fathers to ſay ſo, becauſe the Church ſays ſo, which is Infallible. Yea, *but reaſon will ſhew this to be the meaning of them.* Yes, if we may uſe our Reaſon, and rely upon it. Otherwiſe, as light ſhews nothing to the Blind, or to him that uſes not his eyes; ſo reaſon cannot prove any thing to him that either has not, or uſes not his reaſon to judge of them.

120. Thus you have excluded your ſelf from all proof of your Churches Infallibility from Scripture or Tradition. And if you fly laſtly to Reaſon it ſelf for ſuccour, may not it juſtly ſay to you, as *Jephte* ſaid to his Brethren, *Ye have caſt me out and baniſhed me, and do you now come to me for ſuccour?* But if there be no certainty in Reaſon, how ſhall I be aſſured of the certainty of thoſe which you aledge for this purpoſe? Either I may judge of them, or not: if not, why do you propoſe them? If I may, why

do

do you ſay I may not, and make it ſuch a monſtrous abſurdity, That men in the choice of their Religion ſhould make uſe of their Reaſon? which yet, without all queſtion, none but unreaſonable men can deny, to have been the chiefeſt end why Reaſon was given them.

121. Ad §. 22.] An Heretick *he is* (ſaith D. Potter) *who oppoſeth any truth, which to be a Divine Revelation, he is convinced in Conſcience by any means whatſoever: Be it by a Preacher or Lay-man, be it by reading Scripture, or hearing them read.* And from hence you infer, that *he makes all theſe ſafe propounders of Faith.* A moſt ſtrange and illogical deduction! For may not a private man by evident reaſon convince another man, that ſuch or ſuch a Doctrine is Divine Revelation, and yet though he be a true propounder in this point, yet propound another thing falſely, and without proof, and conſequently not be a ſafe propounder in every point? Your Preachers in their Sermons, do they not propoſe to men Divine Revelations, and do they not ſometimes convince men in Conſcience, by evident proof from Scripture, that the things they ſpeak are Divine Revelations? And whoſoever being thus convinced, ſhould oppoſe this Divine Revelation, ſhould he not be an *Heretick*, according to your own grounds, for calling Gods own Truth into queſtion? And would you think your ſelf well dealt with, if I ſhould collect from hence, that you make every Preacher a ſafe, that is, an infallible Propounder of Faith? Be the means of Propoſal what it will, ſufficient or inſufficient, worthy of credit, or not worthy, though it were, if it were poſſible, the barking of a Dog, or the chirping of a Bird, or were it the Diſcourſe of the Devil himſelf, yet if I be, I will not ſay convinced, but perſuaded, though falſly, that it is a Divine Revelation, and ſhall deny to believe it, I ſhall be a formal, though not a material *Heretick*. For he that believes, though falſly any thing to be Divine Revelation, and yet will not believe it to be true, muſt of neceſſity believe God to be falſe, which according to your own Doctrine, is the formality of an *Heretick*.

122. And

122. And how it can be any way advantagious to Civil Government, that men without warrant from God ſhould Uſurp a Tyranny over other mens Conſciences, and preſcribe unto them without reaſon, and ſometimes againſt reaſon, what they ſhall believe, you muſt ſhew us plainer if you deſire we ſhould believe. For to ſay, *Verily I do not ſee but that it muſt be ſo*, is no good demonſtration. For whereas you ſay, *that a Man may be a paſſionate and Seditious Creature*, from whence you would have us infer, that he may make uſe of his interpretation to ſatisfie his Paſſion, and raiſe Sedition: There were ſome colour in this conſequence, if we (as you do) made private men infallible interpreters for others; for then indeed they might lead Diſciples after them, and uſe them as Inſtruments for their vile purpoſes: But when we ſay they can only interpret for themſelves, what harm they can do by their paſſionate or ſeditious interpretations, but only endanger both their Temporal and Eternal happineſs, I cannot imagine. For though we deny the *Pope* or Church of *Rome* to be an infallible Judge, yet we do not deny, but that there are Judges which may proceed with certainty enough againſt all Seditious Perſons, ſuch as draw men to diſobedience either againſt Church or State, as well as againſt Rebels, and Traytors, and Thieves, and Murderers.

123. Ad §. 23.] The next § argues thus: *For many Ages there was no Scripture in the World: and for many more, there was none in many places of the World: yet men wanted not then and there ſome certain direction what to believe: Therefore there was then an Infallible Judge.* Juſt as if I ſhould ſay, *York* is not my way from *Oxford* to *London*, therefore *Briſtol* is: Or a Dog is not a Horſe, therefore he is a Man. As if God had no other ways of revealing himſelf to men, but only by Scripture and an infallible Church. *S. *Chryſoſtome* and *Iſidorus Peluſiota* conceived he might uſe other means. And S. *Paul* telleth us that the γνωστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ *might be known by his Works*; and that *they had the Law written in their Hearts.* Either of theſe ways might make ſome faithful men without either neceſſity of Scripture or Church.

* See *Chryſoſt. Hom.* 1. *in Mat. Iſidor. Peluſ. l.* 3. *ep.* 106. and alſo *Baſil.* in *Pſ.* 28. and then you ſhall confeſs that by other means beſides theſe, God did communicate himſelf unto men and made them receive and underſtand his Laws: ſee alſo to the ſame purpoſe *Heb.* 1. 1.

124. *But*

124. *But D.* Potter *ſays* (you ſay,) *In the Jewiſh Church there was a living Judge, indowed with an abſolute infallible direction in caſes of moment: as all points belonging to Divine Faith are.* And where was that infallible direction in the Jewiſh Church when they ſhould have received Chriſt for their *Meſſias*, and refuſed him? Or perhaps this was not a caſe of moment. D. *Potter* indeed might ſay very well, not that the high Prieſt was infallible, (for certainly he was not) but that his determination was to be of neceſſity obeyed, though for the juſtice of it there was no neceſſity that it ſhould be believed. Beſides, it is one thing to ſay, that the living judge in the Jewiſh Church, had an infallible direction: another, that he was neceſſitated to follow this direction. This is the priviledge which you challenge. But it is that, not this, which the Doctor attributes to the *Jews*. As a man may truly ſay, the Wiſe men had an infallible direction to Chriſt, without ſaying or thinking that they were conſtrained to follow it, and could not do otherwiſe.

125. *But either the Church retains ſtill her infallibility, or it was deveſted of it upon the receiving of Holy Scripture; which is abſurd.* An Argument methinks like this, Either you have Horns or you have loſt them: but you never loſt them, therefore you have them ſtill. If you ſay you never had Horns; ſo ſay I, for ought appears by your reaſons, the Church never had infallibility.

126. *But ſome Scriptures were received in ſome places and not in others: therefore if Scriptures were the Judge of Controverſies, ſome Churches had one Judge and ſome another.* And what great inconvenience is there in that, that one part of *England* ſhould have one Judge, and another another? eſpecially ſeeing the Books of Scripture which were received by thoſe that received feweſt, had as much of the Doctrine of Chriſtianity in them, as they all had which were received by any; all the neceſſary parts of the Goſpel being contained in every one of the four Goſpels, as I have proved: So that they which had all the Books of the *New Teſtament* had nothing ſuperfluous: For it was not ſuperfluous but profitable, that the ſame

ſame thing ſhould be ſaid divers times, and be teſtified by divers witneſſes: And they that had but one of the four Goſpels wanted nothing neceſſary: and therefore it is vainly inferred by you, that *with Months and Years, as new Canonical Scriptures grew to be publiſhed, the Church altered her rule of Faith and judge of Controverſies.*

127. *Hereſies*, you ſay, *would ariſe after the Apoſtles time and after the writing of Scriptures: Theſe cannot be diſcovered, condemned and avoided, unleſs the Church be Infallible; Therefore there muſt be a Church infallible.* But I pray tell me, Why cannot *Hereſies* be ſufficiently diſcovered, condemned, & avoided, by them which believe Scripture to be the rule of Faith? If Scripture be ſufficient to inform us what is the Faith, it muſt of neceſſity be alſo ſufficient to teach us what is *Hereſie*: ſeeing *Hereſie* is nothing but a manifeſt deviation from, and an oppoſition to the Faith. That which is ſtraight will plainly teach us what is crooked; and one contrary cannot but manifeſt the other. If any one ſhould deny, that there is a God: That this God is omnipotent, omniſcient, good, juſt, true, merciful, a rewarder of them that ſeek him, a puniſher of them that obſtinately offend him; that Jeſus Chriſt is the Son of God, and the Saviour of the World: that it is he by obedience to whom men muſt look to be ſaved: If any man ſhould deny either his Birth, or Paſſion, or Reſurrection, or Aſcenſion, or ſitting at the right Hand of God: his having all Power given him in Heaven and Earth: That it is he whom God hath appointed to be Judge of the Quick and the Dead: that all men ſhall Riſe again at the laſt Day: That they which believe and repent ſhall be ſaved: That they which do not believe or repent ſhall be damned: If a man ſhould hold, that either the keeping of the *Moſaical* Law is neceſſary to Salvation: or that good works are not neceſſary to Salvation: In a word, if any man ſhould obſtinatly contradict the truth of any thing plainly delivered in Scripture, who does not ſee, that every one which believes the Scripture, hath a ſufficient means to diſcover, and condemn, and avoid that *Hereſie*, without

any need of an infallible guide? If you ſay, that *the obſcure places of Scripture contain matters of Faith*: I anſwer, that it is a matter of Faith to believe that the ſenſe of them, whatſoever it is, which was intended by God is true; for he that does not do ſo calls Gods Truth into queſtion. But to believe this or that to be the true ſenſe of them, or, to believe the true ſenſe of them, and to avoid the falſe, is not neceſſary either to Faith or Salvation. For if God would have had his meaning in theſe places certainly known, how could it ſtand with his wiſdom, to be ſo wanting to his own will and end, as to ſpeak obſcurely? or how can it conſiſt with his Juſtice, to require of men to know certainly the meaning of thoſe words, which he himſelf hath not revealed? Suppoſe there were an abſolute Monarch, that in his own abſenſe from one of his Kingdoms, had written Laws for the Government of it, ſome very plainly, and ſome very ambiguouſly, and obſcurely, and his Subjects ſhould keep thoſe that were plainly written with all exactneſs, and for thoſe that were obſcure, uſe their beſt diligence to find his meaning in them, and obey them according to the ſenſe of them which they conceived? ſhould this King either with juſtice or wiſdom be offended with theſe Subjects, if by reaſon of the obſcurity of them, they miſtook the ſenſe of them, and fail of performance, by reaſon of their Error?

128. But, *It is more uſeful & fit*, you ſay, *for the deciding of Controverſies, to have beſides an infallible Rule to go by, a living infallible Judge to determine them: & from hence* you *conclude, that certainly there is ſuch a Judge.* But why then may not another ſay, that it is yet more uſeful for many excellent purpoſes, that all the Patriarchs ſhould be infallible, than that the *Pope* only ſhould? Another, that it would be yet more uſeful, that all the Archbiſhops of every Province ſhould be ſo, than that the Patriarchs only ſhould be ſo. Another, that it would be yet more uſeful, if all the Biſhops of every Dioceſs were ſo. Another, that it would be yet more available, that all the Parſons of every Pariſh ſhould be ſo. Another,

ther, that it would be yet more excellent, if all the Fathers of Families were ſo. And laſtly, another, that it were much more to be deſired that every Man and every Woman were ſo: juſt as much as the prevention of Controverſies, is better than the deciſion of them, and the prevention of Hereſies better than the condemnation of them; and upon this ground conclude, by your own very conſequence, That not only a general Council, nor only the Pope, but all the Patriarchs, Archbiſhops, Biſhops, Paſtors, Fathers, nay all the men in the World are infallible. If you ſay now, as I am ſure you will, that this concluſion is moſt groſs, and abſurd againſt ſenſe and experience, then muſt alſo theground be falſe, from which it evidently and undeniably follows, *viz.* that, That courſe of dealing with men ſeems always more fit to Divine Providence, which ſeems moſt fit to humane reaſon.

129. And ſo likewiſe, That there ſhould men ſucceed the Apoſtles, which could ſhew themſelves to be their ſucceſſors, by doing of Miracles, by ſpeaking all kind of Languages, by delivering men to Satan, as S. *Paul* did *Hymenæus*, and the inceſtuous *Corinthian*, it is manifeſt in human reaſon it were incomparably more fit and uſeful for the deciſion of Controverſies, than that the ſucceſſour of the Apoſtles ſhould have none of theſe gifts, and for want of the ſigns of Apoſtleſhip, be juſtly queſtionable whether he be his ſucceſſor or no: and will you now conclude, That the Popes have the gift of doing Miracles, as well as the Apoſtles had?

130. It were in all reaſon very uſeful and requiſite, that the Pope ſhould, by the aſſiſtance of Gods Spirit, be freed from the vices and paſſions of men, leſt otherwiſe, the Authority given him for the good of the Church, he might imploy (as divers Popes you well know have done) to the diſturbance, and oppreſſion and miſchief of it. And will you conclude from hence, That Popes are not ſubject to the ſins and paſſions of other men? That there never have been ambitious, covetous, luſtful, tyrannous Popes.

131. Who ſees not that for mens direction it were much more beneficial for the Church, that Infallibility ſhould

be ſetled in the Popes Perſon, than in a general Council: That ſo the means of deciding Controverſies might be ſpeedy, eaſie and perpetual, whereas that of general Councils is not ſo. And will you hence infer, that not the Church Repreſentative, but the Pope is indeed the infallible Judge of Controverſies? certainly if you ſhould, the *Sorbon* Doctors would not think this a good concluſion.

132. It had been very commodious (one would think) that, ſeeing either Gods pleaſure was the Scripture ſhould be tranſlated, or elſe in his Providence he knew it would be ſo, that he had appointed ſome men for this buſineſs, and by his Spirit aſſiſted them in it, that ſo we might have Tranſlations as Authentical as the Original: yet you ſee God did not think fit to do ſo.

133. It had been very commodious (one would think) that the Scripture ſhould have been, at leaſt for all things neceſſary, a Rule, plain and perfect: And yet you ſay, it is both imperfect and obſcure, even in things neceſſary.

134. It had been moſt requiſite (one would think) that the Copies of the Bibles, ſhould have been preſerved free from variety of Readings, which makes men very uncertain in many places, which is the Word of God, and which is the error or preſumption of man: and yet we ſee God hath not thought fit ſo to provide for us.

135. Who can conceive, but that an Apoſtolick Interpretation of all the difficult places of Scripture, would have been ſtrangely beneficial to the Church, eſpecially there being ſuch danger in miſtaking the ſenſe of them, as is by you pretended, and God in his providence foreſeeing that the greateſt part of Chriſtians, would not accept of the Pope for the Judge of Controverſies? And yet we ſee God hath not ſo ordered the matter.

136. Who doth not ſee, that ſuppoſing the Biſhop of *Rome*, had been appointed Head of the Church, and Judge of Controverſies, that it would have been infinitely beneficial to the Church, perhaps as much as all the reſt of the Bible, that in ſome Book of Scripture which was to be undoubtedly received, this one Propoſition had been ſet down in Terms, *The Biſhops of* Rome *ſhall be always Monarchs*

narchs of the Church, and they either alone, or with their adherents, the Guides of Faith, and the Judges of Controverſies that ſhall ariſe amongſt Chriſtians? This, if you will deal ingenuouſly, you cannot but acknowledge; for then all true Chriſtians would have ſubmitted to him, as willingly as to Chriſt himſelf, neither needed you and your fellows, have troubled your ſelf to invent ſo many Sophiſms for the proof of it. There would have been no more doubt of it among Chriſtians, than there is of the Nativity, Paſſion, Reſurrection or Aſcenſion of Chriſt. You were beſt now rub your forehead hard, and conclude upon us, that becauſe this would have been ſo uſeful to have been done, therefore it is done. Or if you be (as I know you are) too ingenuous to ſay ſo, then muſt you acknowledge, that the ground of your Argument, which is the very ground of all theſe abſurdities, is moſt abſurd; and that it is our duty to be humbly thankful for thoſe ſufficient, nay abundant means of Salvation, which God hath of his own goodneſs granted us: and not conclude, he hath done that which he hath not done, becauſe forſooth, in our vain judgments it ſeems convenient he ſhould have done ſo.

137. But you demand *what repugnance there is betwixt infallibility in the Church, and exiſtence of Scripture, that the production of the one muſt be the deſtruction of the other?* Out of which words I can frame no other argument for you than this. *There is no Repugnance between the Scriptures exiſtence, and the Churches infallibility, therefore the Church is infallible.* Which conſequence will then be good, when you can ſhew, that nothing can be untrue, but that only which is impoſſible; that whatſoever may be done, that alſo is done. Which, if it were true, would conclude both you and me to be infallible, as well as either your Church, or Pope: in as much as there is no more repugnance between the Scriptures exiſtence and our infallibility, than there is between theirs.

138. Obj. *But if Proteſtants will have the Scripture alone for their Judge, let them firſt produce ſome Scripture, affirming, that by the entrance thereof, infallibility went out of the Church.* *Anſ.*

Anſ. This Argument put in form runs thus. No Scripture affirms that by the entring thereof, infallibility went out of the Church: Therefore there is an infallible Church, and therefore the Scripture alone is not Judge, that is, the Rule to judge by. But as no Scripture affirms that by the entring of it, Infallibility went out of the Church, ſo neither do we, neither have we any need to do ſo. But we ſay, that it continued in the Church even together with the Scriptures, ſo long as Chriſt and his Apoſtles were living, and then departed: God in his providence having provided a plain and infallible Rule, to ſupply the defect of living and infallible Guides.

141. *But the Jewiſh Church retained Infallibility in her ſelf; and therefore it is unjuſt to deprive the Church of Chriſt of it.*

Anſ. That the Jews had ſometimes an infallible miraculous direction from God, in ſome caſes of moment, he doth affirm and had good warrant: but that the Synagogue was abſolutely Infallible, he no where affirms, and therefore it is unjuſtly and unworthily done of you to obtrude it upon him. And indeed how can the Infallibility of the Synagogue be conceived, but only by ſetling it in the High Prieſt, and the company adhering and ſubordinate unto him? And whether the High Prieſt was Infallible, when he believed not Chriſt to be the *Meſſias*, but condemned and excommunicated them that ſo profeſſed, and cauſed him to be crucified for ſaying ſo, I leave it to Chriſtians to judge. But then ſuppoſe God had been ſo pleaſed to do as he did not, to appoint the Synagouge an infallible guide: Could you by your rules of Logick conſtrain him, to appoint ſuch a one to Chriſtians alſo, or ſay unto him, that, in wiſdom he could not do otherwiſe? Vain man that will be thus always tying God to your imaginations! It is well for us that he leaves us not without directions to him, but if he will do this ſometime by living Guides, ſometime by written Rules, what is that to you? may not he do what he will with his own?

144. *Ad* §. 24. Neither is this Diſcourſe (if you mean your Concluſion, that *Your Church is the infallible Judge*

in

in Controversies) confirmed by *Irenæus* at all *(Iren.* l. 3. c. 3.) For neither has *Irenæus* one syllable to this purpose, neither can it be deduced out of what he says, with any colour of consequence. For first in saying, *What if the Apostles had not left Scripture, ought we not to have followed the Order of Tradition?* And in saying, *That to this Order many Nations yield assent, who believe in Christ, having Salvation written in their hearts, by the Spirit of God, without Letters or Ink, and diligently keeping ancient Tradition:* Doth he not plainly shew, that the Tradition he speaks of, is nothing else, but the very same that is written: nothing but to believe in Christ? To which, whether Scripture alone to them that believe it, be not a sufficient guide, I leave it to you to judge. And are not his words just as if a man should say, If God had not given us the light of the Sun, we must have made use of Candles and Torches: If we had had no Eyes, we must have felt out our way: If we had no Leggs, we must have used Crutches. And doth not this in effect import, that while we have the Sun, we need no Candles? While we have our Eyes, we need not feel out our way? While we enjoy our Leggs, we need not Crutches? And by like reason, *Irenæus* in saying, *If we had no Scripture, we must have followed Tradition, and they that have none, do well to do so,* doth he not plainly import, that to them that have Scripture, and believe it, Tradition is unnecessary? which could not be, if the Scripture did not contain evidently the whole tradition. Which whether *Irenæus* believed or no, these words of his may inform you, *Non enim per alios* &c. *we have received the disposition of our Salvation from no others, but from them, by whom the Gospel came unto us. Which Gospel truly, the Apostles first preached, and afterwards by the will of God, delivered in writing to us, to be the Pillar and Foundation of our Faith.* Upon which place *Bellarmine*'s two observations, and his acknowledgment ensuing upon them, are very considerable, and as I conceive, as home to my purpose as I would wish them. His first *Notandum* is, *That in the Christian Doctrin, some things are simply necessary for the Salvation of all men; as the knowledge of the Articles of the Apostles*

Bellarm. de verbo Dei l. 4. c. 11.

Apoſtles Creed; and beſides the knowledge, of the ten Commandments, and ſome of the Sacraments. Other things not ſo neceſſary, but that a man may be ſaved, without the explicit knowledge and belief, and profeſſion of them. His Second Note is, *That thoſe things which were ſimply neceſſary, the Apoſtles were wont to preach to all men; But of other things not all to all, but ſomething to all, to wit, thoſe things which were profitable for all, other things only to Prelats and Prieſts.* Theſe things premiſed, he acknowledgeth, *That all thoſe things were written by the Apoſtles, which are neceſſary for all, and which they were wont openly to preach to all; But that other things were not all written: And therefore, when* Irenæus *ſays that the Apoſtles wrote what they Preach in the World, it is true,* ſaith he, *and not againſt Traditions, becauſe they preached not to the People all things, but only thoſe things, which were neceſſary or profitable for them.*

145. So that at the moſt, you can infer from hence, but only a ſuppoſitive neceſſity of having an infallible Guide, and that grounded upon a falſe ſuppoſition, In caſe we had no Scripture, but an abſolute neceſſity hereof, and to them who have and believe the Scripture, which is your aſſumption, cannot with any colour from hence be concluded, but rather the contrary.

146. Neither becauſe (as he ſays) it was *then eaſie to receive the Truth from Gods Church, then,* in the Age next after the Apoſtles, Then, when all the ancient and Apoſtolick Churches were at an agreement about the Fundamentals of Faith: Will it therefore follow that now, 1600 years after, when the ancient Churches are divided almoſt into as many Religions as they are Churches, every one being the Church to it ſelf, and heretical to all other, that it is as eaſie, but extremely difficult or rather impoſſible, to find the Church firſt independently of the true Doctrin, and then to find the truth by the Church.

148. Neither will the *Apoſtles depoſiting with the Church, all things belonging to truth,* be any proof that the Church ſhall certainly keep this *depoſitum,* entire, and ſincere, without adding to it, or taking from it; for this whole *depoſitum* was committed to every particular Church, nay, to every

every particular Man, which the Apoſtles converted. And yet no man, I think, will ſay, that there was any certainty, that it ſhould be kept whole and inviolate by every man, and every Church. It is apparent out of Scripture, it was committed to *Timothy*, and by him conſigned to other faithful men: and yet S. *Paul* thought it not ſuperfluous, earneſtly to exhort him to the careful keeping of it: which exhortation you muſt grant had been vain and ſuperfluous, if the not keeping of it had been impoſſible. And therefore though *Irenæus* ſays, *The Apoſtles fully depoſited in the Church all truth*, yet he ſays not, neither can we infer from what he ſays, that the Church ſhould always infallibly keep this *depoſitum*, entire without the loſs of any truth, and ſincere without the mixture of any falſhood.

149. Ad §. 25.] *C. M.* proceeds and tells us, *That beſide all this, the Doctrine of* Proteſtants *is deſtructive of it ſelf. For either they have certain and infallible means not to Err in interpreting; or not. If not, Scripture to them cannot be a ſufficient ground for infallible Faith: If they have, and ſo cannot Err in interpreting Scripture, then they are able with infallibility to hear and determine all Controverſies of Faith; and ſo they may be, and are Judges of Controverſies, although they uſe the Scripture as a Rule. And thus againſt their own Doctrine, they conſtitute another Judge of Controverſies beſides Scripture alone.*

C. H. And may not we with as much reaſon ſubſtitute Church and *Papiſts*, inſtead of Scripture and *Proteſtants*, and ſay unto you, Beſides all this, the Doctrine of *Papiſts* is deſtructive of it ſelf. For either they have certain and infallible means not to Err, in the choice of the Church, and interpreting her decrees, or they have not: If not, then the Church to them cannot be a ſufficient (but meerly a phantaſtical) ground for infallible Faith, nor a meet Judge of Controverſies: (For unleſs I be infallibly ſure that the Church is infallible, how can I be upon her Authority infallibly ſure, that any thing ſhe ſays is infallible?) If they have certain infallible means, and ſo cannot Err in the choice of their Church, and in

interpreting her decrees, then they are able with Infallibility to hear, examine, and determine all Controverſies of Faith, although they pretend to make the Church their Guide, And thus againſt their own Doctrine, they conſtitute another Judge of Controverſies, beſides the Church alone. Nay every one makes himſelf a chooſer of his own Religion, and of his own ſenſe of the Churches decrees, which very thing in *Proteſtants* they ſo highly condemn: and ſo in judging others, condemn themſelves.

150. Neither in ſaying thus have I only cried quittance with you: but that you may ſee how much you are in my debt, I will ſhew unto you, that for your Sophiſm againſt our way, I have given you a Demonſtration againſt yours. Firſt, I ſay, your Argument againſt us, is a tranſparent fallacy. The firſt part of it lies thus: *Proteſtants* have no means to interpret, without Error, obſcure and ambiguous places of Scripture; therefore plain places of Scripture cannot be to them a ſufficient ground of Faith. But though we pretend not to certain means of not Erring, in interpreting all Scripture, particularly ſuch places as are obſcure and ambiguous, yet this methinks ſhould be no impediment but that we may have certainmeans of not Erring in and about the ſenſe of thoſe places, which are ſo plain and clear that they need no Interpreters; and in ſuch we ſay our Faith is contained. If you ask me how I can be ſure that I know the true meaning of theſe places? I ask you again, can you be ſure that you underſtand what I, or any man elſe ſays? They that heard our Saviour and the Apoſtles Preach, could they have ſufficient aſſurance, that they underſtood at any time, what they would have them do? if not, to what end did they hear them? If they could, why may we not be as well aſſured, that we underſtand ſufficiently, what we conceive plain in their writings?

151. Again I pray tell us, whether you do certainly know the ſenſe of theſe Scriptures, with which you pretend you are led to the knowledg of your Church? If you do not, how know you that there is any Church Infallible, and that theſe are the Notes of it, and that, this

this is the Church that hath theſe Notes? If you do, then give us leave to have the ſame means, and the ſame abilities to know other plain places, which you have to know theſe. For if all Scripture be obſcure, how come you to know the ſenſe of theſe places? If ſome places of it be plain, why ſhould we ſtay here?

152. And now, to come to the other part of your dilemma; in ſaying, *If they have certain means, and ſo cannot Err*, methinks you forget your ſelf very much, and ſeem to make no difference, between, having certain means to do a thing, and the actual doing of it. As if you ſhould conclude, becauſe all men have certain means of Salvation, therefore all men certainly muſt be ſaved, and cannot do otherwiſe; as if whoſoever had a Horſe muſt preſently get up and Ride; Whoſoever had means to find out a way, could not neglect thoſe means and ſo miſtake it, God be thanked, that we have ſufficient means to be certain enough of the truth of our Faith. But the Priviledge of not being in poſſibility of Erring, that we challenge not, becauſe we have as little reaſon as you to do ſo: and you have none at all. If you ask, ſeeing we may poſſibly Err, how can we be aſſured we do not? I ask you again, ſeeing your Eye-ſight may deceive you, how can you be ſure you ſee the Sun, when you do ſee it? Perhaps you may be in a dream, and perhaps you, and all the men in the World have been ſo, when they thought they were awake, and then only awake, when they thought they Dreamt. But this I am ſure of, as ſure as that God is good, that he will require no impoſſibilities of us: not an Infallible, nor a certainly--unerring belief, unleſs he hath given us certain means to avoid Error; and if we uſe thoſe which we have, will never require of us, that we uſe that which we have not.

153. Now from this miſtaken ground, that it is all one to have means of avoiding Error, and to be in no danger nor poſſibility of Error; You infer upon us as an abſurd concluſion, *That we make our ſelves able to determine Controverſies of Faith with Infallibility, and Judges of Controverſies.* For the latter part of this inference, we ac-

knowledge and embrace it. We do make our ſelves Judges of Controverſies: that is, we do make uſe of our own underſtanding in the choice of our Religion. But this, if it be a crime, is common to us with you, (as I have proved above) and the difference is, not that we are chooſers, and you not chooſers, but that we, as we conceive, chooſe wiſely, but you being wilfully blind chooſe to follow thoſe that are ſo too; not remembring what our Saviour hath told you, *when the Blind lead the Blind, both ſhall fall into the Ditch.* But then again I muſt tell you, you have done ill to confound together, Judges, and infallible Judges; unleſs you will ſay, either that we have no Judges in our Courts of Civil judicature, or that they are all Infallible.

154. Thus have we caſt off your dilemma, and broken both the Horns of it. But now my retortion lies heavy upon you, and will not be turned off. For firſt you content not your ſelves with a moral certainty of the things you believe, nor with ſuch a degree of aſſurance of them, as is ſufficient to produce obedience to the condition of the new Covenant, which is all that we require. Gods Spirit, if he pleaſe, may Work more, and certainty of adherence beyond a certainty of evidence. But neither God doth, nor man may require of us, as our Duty, to give a greater aſſent to the concluſion than the premiſes deſerve; to build an infallible Faith upon Motives that are only highly credible, and not infallible, as it were a great and heavy building upon a Foundation that hath not ſtrength proportionable. But though God require not of us ſuch unreaſonable things, You do, and tell men they cannot be ſaved, unleſs they believe your Propoſals with an infallible Faith. To which end they muſt believe alſo your Propounder, your Church, to be ſimply Infallible. Now how is it poſſible for them to give a rational aſſent to the Churches infallibility, unleſs they have ſome infallible means to know that ſhe is infallible? Neither can they infallibly know the infallibility of this means, but by ſome other, and ſo on for ever: unleſs they can dig ſo deep as to come at length to the Rock, that is, *to ſettle all upon ſomething evident of it ſelf,* which

is

is not ſo much as pretended. But the laſt reſolution of all is into Motives, which indeed upon examination will ſcarce appear probable, but are not ſo much as avouched to be any more than very credible. For example, if I ask you why you do believe Tranſubſtantiation? What can you anſwer, but becauſe it is a Revelation of the prime Verity. I demand again, how can you aſſure your ſelf or me of that, being ready to embrace it if it may appear to be ſo? And what can you ſay, but that you know it to be ſo, becauſe the Church ſays ſo, which is Infallible. If I ask, what mean You by your Church? You can tell me nothing, but the Company of Chriſtians which adhere to the *Pope*. I demand then laſtly: Why ſhould I believe this Company to be the Infallible Propounder of Divine Revelation? And then you tell me, that there are many Motives to induce a Man to this belief. But are theſe Motives laſtly infallible? No ſay you, but very credible. Well, let them paſs for ſuch, becauſe now we have not leiſure to examine them. Yet methinks ſeeing the Motives to believe the Churches infallibility, are only very credible, it ſhould alſo be but as credible that your Church is Infallible, and as credible, and no more, perhaps ſomewhat leſs, that her Propoſals, particularly Tranſubſtantiation, are Divine Revelations. And methinks You ſhould require only a Moral, and Modeſt aſſent to them, and not a Divine as you call it, and Infallible Faith. But then of theſe Motives to the Churches Infallibility, I hope you will give us leave to conſider, and judge whether they be indeed Motives, and ſufficient; or whether they be not Motiues at all, or not ſufficient; or whether theſe Motives or Inducements to your Church be not impeached, and oppoſed with Compulſives, and enforcements, from it; or laſtly, whether theſe Motives which You uſe, be not indeed only Motives to Chriſtianity, and not to *Popery*: give me leave for diſtinction ſake to call your Religion ſo. If we may not judge of theſe things, how can my judgment be moved with that which comes not within its cognizance? If I may, then at leaſt I am to be a Judge of all theſe Con-

Controverſies. 1. Whether every one of theſe Motives be indeed a Motive to any Church? 2. If to ſome, whether to Yours? 3. If to Yours, whether ſufficient, or inſufficient? 4. Whether other Societies have not as many, and as great Motives to draw me to them? 5. Whether I have not greater reaſon to believe you do Err, than that you cannot? And now Sir I pray let me trouble You with a few more Queſtions. Am I a ſufficient Judge of theſe Controverſies, or no? If of theſe, why ſhall I ſtay here, why not of others? Why not of all? Nay doth not the true examining of theſe few, contain and lay upon me the examination of all? What other Motives to your Church have you, but your Notes of it? *Bellarmine* gives ſome 14. or 15. And one of theſe fifteen contains in it the examination of all Controverſies, and not only ſo, but of all uncontroverted Doctrines. For how ſhall I, or can I know the Church of *Romes* conformity with the Ancient Church, unleſs I know firſt what the Ancient Church did hold, and then what the Church of *Rome* doth hold; and laſtly, whether they be conformable, or if in my judgment they ſeem not conformable, I am then to think the Church of *Rome* not to be the Church, for want of the Note which ſhe pretends is proper, and perpetual to it. So that for ought I can ſee, Judges we are and muſt be of all ſides, every one for himſelf, and God for us all.

155. §. 26.] C. M. *I ask, whether this Aſſertion (Scripture alone is Judge of all Controverſies in Faith) be a Fundamental point of Faith or no?*

CHIL. I anſwer; This aſſertion, that *Scripture alone is Judge of all Controverſies in Faith,* if it be taken properly, is neither a Fundamental nor Unfundamental point of Faith, nor no point of Faith at all, but a plain falſhood. It is not *a Judge of Controverſies but a Rule to Judge them by*; and that not an abſolutely perfect Rule, but as perfect as a written Rule can be; which muſt always need ſomething elſe, which is either evidently true, or evidently credible to give atteſtation to it, and that in this caſe is Univerſal Tradition. So that Univerſal Tradition

dition is the Rule to judge all Controverſies by. But then becauſe nothing beſides Scripture, comes to us with as full a ſtream of Tradition as Scripture, Scripture alone, and no unwritten Doctrine, nor no Infallibility of any Church, having atteſtation from Tradition truly Univerſal; for this reaſon we conceive, as the Apoſtles perſons while they were living were the only Judges of Controverſies, ſo their Writings, now they are dead, are the only Rule for us to judge them by: There being nothing unwritten, which can go in upon half ſo fair Cards, for the Title of Apoſtolick Tradition, as theſe things which by the confeſſion of both Sides are not ſo: I mean *the Doctrine of the Millinaries,* and *of the neceſſity of the Euchariſt for Infants.*

156. Yet when we ſay, the Scripture is the only Rule to Judge all Controverſies by, methinks you ſhould eaſily conceive, that we would be underſtood of all thoſe that are poſſible to be Judged by Scripture, and of thoſe that ariſe among ſuch as believe the Scripture. For if I had a Controverſie with an *Atheiſt* whether there were a God or no, I would not ſay, that the Scripture were a Rule to judge this by: ſeeing that doubting whether there be a God or no, he muſt needs doubt whether the Scripture be the Word of God: or if he does not, he grants the Queſtion, and is not the man we ſpeak of. So likewiſe, if I had a Controverſie about the Truth of Chriſt with a *Jew,* it would be vainly done of me, ſhould I preſs him with the Authority of the *New Teſtament* which he believes not, until out of ſome Principles common to us both, I had perſuaded him that it is the Word of God. The *New Teſtament* therefore while he remains a *Jew* would not be a fit Rule to decide this Controverſie; In as much as that which is doubted of it ſelf, is not fit to determine other doubts. So likewiſe if there were any that believed Chriſtian Religion, and yet believed not the Bible to be the Word of God, though they believed the matter of it to be true, (which is no impoſſible ſuppoſition, for I may believe a Book of S. *Auſtines,* to contain nothing but the Truth of God, and yet not to have been.

been inſpired by God himſelf,) againſt ſuch men therefore there were no diſputing out of the Bible; becauſe nothing in queſtion can be a proof to it ſelf. When therefore we ſay the Scripture is a ſufficient means to determine all Controverſies, we ſay not this, either to *Atheiſts, Jews, Turks,* or ſuch Chriſtians (if there be any ſuch) as believe not Scripture to be the Word of God. But among ſuch men only, as are already agreed upon this, That the Scripture is the Word of God, we ſay all Controverſies that ariſe about Faith, are either not at all decidable and conſequently not neceſſary to be believed one way or other, or they may be determined by Scripture. In a Word, That all things neceſſary to be believed are evidently contained in Scripture, and what is not there evidently contained, cannot be neceſſary to be believed. And our reaſon hereof is convincing; becauſe nothing can Challenge our belief, but what hath deſcended to us from Chriſt by Original and Univerſal Tradition: Now nothing but Scripture hath thus deſcended to us, Therefore nothing but Scripture can Challenge our belief. Now then to come up cloſer to you, and to anſwer to your Queſtion, not as you put it, but as you ſhould have put it: I ſay, That this poſition, *Scripture alone is the Rule whereby they which believe it to be Gods Word are to judge all Controverſies in Faith,* is no fundamental point. Though not for your Reaſons: For your firſt and ſtrongeſt reaſon you ſee is plainly voided and cut off by my ſtating of the Queſtion as I have done, and ſuppoſing in it that the parties at variance are agreed about this, That the Scripture is the Word of God; and conſequently that this is none of their Controverſies. To your ſecond, That *Controverſies cannot be ended without ſome living Authority,* We have ſaid already, that neceſſary Controverſies may be and are decided. And if they be not ended, this is not through defect of the Rule, but through the default of Men. And for theſe that cannot thus be ended, it is not neceſſary they ſhould be ended. For if God did require the ending of them, he would have provided ſome certain means for the ending of them. And to your Third, I ſay, that your

your pretence of uſing theſe means is but hypocrital: for you uſe them with prejudice, and with a ſetled reſolution not to believe any thing which theſe means happily may ſuggeſt into you, if it any way croſs your pre-conceived perſwaſion of your Churches infallibility. You give not your ſelves liberty of judgment in the uſe of them, nor ſuffer your ſelves to be led by them to the Truth, to which they would lead you, would you but be as willing to believe this conſequence, Our Church doth oppoſe Scripture, therefore it doth err, therefore it is not Infallible, as you are reſolute to believe this, The Church is Infallible, therefore it doth not err, and therefore it doth not oppoſe Scripture, though it ſeem to do ſo never ſo plainly.

157. You pray, but it is not that God would bring you to the true Religion, but that he would confirm you in your own. You confer places, but it is that you may confirm, or colour over with plauſible diſguiſes your erroneous doctrine, not that you may judge of them and forſake them if there be reaſon for it. You conſult the Originals, but you regard them not when they make againſt your Doctrin or Tranſlation.

159. Notwithſtanding, though not for theſe reaſons, yet for others, I conceive this Doctrin not Fundamental: Becauſe if a man ſhould believe Chriſtian Religion wholly, and entirely, and live according to it, ſuch a man, though he ſhould not know or not believe the Scripture to be a Rule of Faith, no nor to be the Word of God, my opinion is he may be ſaved; and my reaſon is, becauſe he performs the entire condition of the new Covenant, which is, that we believe the matter of the Goſpel, and not that it is contained in theſe or theſe Books. So that the Books of Scripture are not ſo much the objects of our Faith, as the inſtruments of conveying it to our underſtanding; and not ſo much of the being of the Chriſtian Doctrin, as requiſite to the well-being of it. *Iræneus* tells us (as M. K. acknowledgeth) of ſome barbarous Nations, that *believed the Doctrin of Chriſt, and yet believed not the Scripture to be the Word of God, for they never heard of it, and Faith comes by hearing:* But theſe barbarous people might be ſaved:

therefore men might be ſaved without believing the Scripture to be the Word of God; much more without believing it to be a Rule, and a perfect Rule of Faith. Neither doubt I, but if the Books of Scripture had been propoſed to them by the other parts of the Church, where they had been before received, and had been doubted of, or even rejected by thoſe barbarous Nations, but ſtill by the bare belief and practice of Chriſtianity, they might be ſaved: God requiring of us under pain of damnation, only to believe the verities therein contained, and not the divine Authority of the Books wherein they are contained. Not but that it were now very ſtrange and unreaſonable, if a man ſhould believe the matter of theſe Books, and not the Authority of the Books: and therefore if a man ſhould profeſs the not believing of theſe, I ſhould have reaſon to fear he did not believe that. But there is not always an equal neceſſity for the belief of thoſe things, for the belief whereof there is an equal reaſon. We have I believe as great reaſon to believe there was ſuch a man as *Henry the VIII. King of England*, as that *Jeſus Chriſt* ſuffered under *Pontius Pilate:* yet this is neceſſary to be believed, and that is not ſo. So that if any man ſhould doubt of or diſbelieve that, it were moſt unreaſonably done of him, yet it were no mortal ſin, nor no ſin at all: God having no where commanded men under pain of damnation to believe all which reaſon induceth them to believe. Therefore as an Executor, that ſhould perform the whole Will of the dead, ſhould fully ſatisfie the Law, though he did not believe that Parchment to be his written Will, which indeed is ſo: So I believe, that he who believes all the particular doctrines which integrate Chriſtianity, and lives according to them, ſhould be ſaved, though he neither believed nor knew that the Goſpels were written by the Evangeliſts, or the Epiſtles by the Apoſtles.

160. This diſcourſe whether it be rational and concluding or no, I ſubmit to better judgment; But ſure I am, that the corollary which you draw from this poſition, *that this point is not Fundamental*, is very inconſequent; that is, *that we are uncertain of the truth of it*, becauſe we ſay the whole

whole Church, much more particular Churches and private men may err in points not Fundamental. A pretty Sophiſm, depending upon this Principle, that whoſoever poſſibly may err, he cannot be certain that he doth not err. And upon this ground, what ſhall hinder me from concluding, that ſeeing you alſo hold, that neither particular Churches, nor private men are Infallible even in Fundamentals, that even the Fundamentals of Chriſtianity, remain to you uncertain? A Judge may poſſibly err in judgment, can he therefore never have aſſurance that he hath judged right? A Traveller may poſſibly miſtake his way, muſt I therefore be doubtful whether I am in the right way from my Hall to my Chamber? Or can our *London* Carrier have no certainty, in the middle of the day, when he is ſober and in his wits, that he is in the way to *London*? Theſe you ſee are right worthy conſequences, and yet they are as like your own, as an Egg to an Egg, or Milk to Milk.

163. Ad §. 27.] C. M. *S.* Auſtin *plainly affirms that to oppoſe the Churches definitions is to reſiſt God himſelf (ſpeaking of the Controverſie of Rebaptization* de Unit. Eccl. cap. 22.) where he ſaith *that Chriſt bears witneſs to his Church, and whoſoever refuſeth to follow the practice of the Church, doth reſiſt our Saviour himſelf, who by his teſtimony recommends the Church, &c.*

CHIL. I Anſwer, Firſt that in many things you will not be tried by S. *Auguſtines* judgment, nor ſubmit to his authority; not concerning Appeals to *Rome*, not concerning Tranſubſtantiation, not touching the uſe and worſhiping of Images, not concerning the State of Saints ſouls before the day of judgment, not touching the Virgin *Maries* freedom from actual and original ſin, not touching the neceſſity of the Euchariſt for Infants, not touching the damning Infants to Hell that die without Baptiſm, not touching the knowledge of Saints departed, not touching Purgatory, not touching the fallibility of Councils, even general Councils, not touching perfection and perſpicuity of Scripture in matters neceſſary to Salvation, not touching Auricular Confeſſion, not touching the half Commu-

nion, not touching Prayers in an unknown tongue; In theſe things, I ſay, you will not ſtand to S. *Auſtines* judgment, and therefore can with no reaſon or equity require us to do ſo in this matter. 2. To S. *Auguſtine* in heat of diſputation againſt the *Donatiſts*, and ranſacking all places for arguments againſt them, we oppoſe S. *Auſtine* out of this heat, delivering the doctrine of Chriſtianity calmly, and moderately; where he ſays, *In iis quæ apertè poſita ſunt in ſacris Scripturis, omnia ea reperiuntur quæ continent fidem, moreſque vivendi.* 3. We ſay, he ſpeaks not of the *Roman* but the *Catholick Church*, of far greater extent, and therefore of far greater credit and authority than the *Roman* Church. 4 He ſpeaks of a point not expreſſed, but yet not contradicted by Scripture; whereas the errors we charge you with, are contradicted by Scripture. 5. He ſays not that Chriſt has recommended the Church to us for *an Infallible definer of all emergent controverſies*, but for a *credible witneſs of Ancient Tradition.* Whoſoever therefore refuſeth to follow the practice of the Church (underſtand *of all places and ages)* though he be thought to reſiſt our Saviour, what is that to us, who caſt off no practiecs of the Church, but ſuch as are evidently poſt-nate to the time of the Apoſtles, and plainly contrary to the practice of former and purer times. Laſtly it is evident, and even to impudence it ſelf undeniable, that upon this ground, of believing all things taught by the preſent Church as taught by Chriſt, Error was held, for example, the neceſſity of the Euchariſt for Infants, and that in S. *Auſtines* time, and that by S. *Auſtine* himſelf: and therefore without controverſie this is no certain ground for truth, which may ſupport falſhood as well as truth.

164. To the Argument wherewith you conclude, I Anſwer, That though the viſible Church ſhall always without fail propoſe ſo much of Gods revelation, as is ſufficient to bring men to Heaven, for otherwiſe it will not be the viſible Church, yet it may ſometimes add to this revelation things ſuperfluous, nay hurtful, nay in themſelves damnable, though not unpardonable; and ſometimes take from it things very expedient and profitable, and therefore

it

it is poſſible, without ſin, to reſiſt in ſome things the Viſible Church of Chriſt. But you preſs us farther, and demand, *what Viſible Church was extant, when* Luther *began, whether it were the* Roman *or* Proteſtant *Church?* As if it muſt of neceſſity either be *Proteſtant* or *Roman*, or *Roman* of neceſſity, if it were not *Proteſtant!* yet this is the moſt uſual fallacy of all your diſputers, by ſome ſpecious Arguments to perſwade weak men that the Church of *Proteſtants* cannot be the true Church; and thence to infer, that without doubt it muſt be the *Roman*. But why may not the *Roman* be content to be a part of it, and the *Grecian* another? And if one muſt be the whole, why not the *Greek* Church, as well as the *Roman?* there being not one Note of your Church which agrees not to her as well as to your own; unleſs it be, that ſhe is poor, and oppreſſed by the *Turk*, and you are in glory and ſplendor.

CHAP. III.

The ANSWER to the Third CHAPTER.

Wherein it is maintained, That the diſtinction of points Fundamental *and not* Fundamental, *is in this preſent Controverſie good and pertinent: And that the Catholick Church may err in the latter kind of the ſaid points.*

1. THis diſtinction is imployed by *Proteſtants* to many purpoſes, and therefore if it be pertinent and good, (as they underſtand and apply it) the whole Edifice built thereon, muſt be either firm and ſtable, or if it be not, it cannot be for any default in this diſtinction.

2. *If you object to them diſcords in matter of faith without any means of agreement*, They will anſwer you, that they want not good and ſolid means of agreement in matters neceſſary to ſalvation, *viz.* Their belief of all thoſe things which are plainly and undoubtedly delivered in Scripture; which who ſo believes, muſt of neceſſity believe all things neceſſary to ſalvation: and their mutual ſuffering one another,

another, *to abound in their ſeveral ſenſe*, in matters not plainly aud undoubtedly there delivered. And for their agreement in all Controverſies of Religion, either they have means to agree about them, or not: If you ſay they have, why did you before deny it? If they have not means, why do you find fault with them, for not agreeing?

3. You will ſay, that their fault is, that by *remaining* Proteſtants *they exclude themſelves from the means of agreement, which you have*, and which by ſubmiſſion to your Church they might have alſo. But if you have means of agreement, the more ſhame for you that you ſtill diſagree. For who, I pray, is more inexcuſably guilty, for the omiſſion of any duty; they that either have no means to do it, or elſe know of none they have, which puts them in the ſame caſe as if they had none: or they which profeſs to have an eaſie and expedite means to do it, and yet ſtill leave it undone? *If you had been blind* (ſaith our *Saviour* to the *Phariſees*) *you had had no ſin, but now you ſay you ſee, therefore your ſin remaineth.*

4. If you ſay, you *do agree in matters of Faith*, I ſay this is ridiculous: for you define matters of Faith to be thoſe wherein you agree. So that to ſay, you agree in *matters of Faith*, is to ſay, you agree in thoſe things wherein you do agree. And do not *Proteſtants* do ſo likewiſe? Do not they agree in thoſe things, wherein they do agree?

5. But *you are all agreed that only thoſe things wherein you do agree are matters of Faith.* And *Proteſtants* if they were wiſe, would do ſo too. Sure I am they have reaſon enough to do ſo: ſeeing all of them agree with explicite Faith in all thoſe things, which are plainly and undoubtedly delivered in Scripture, that is, in all which God hath plainly revealed: and with an implicite Faith, in that ſenſe of the whole Scripture which God intended whatſoever it was. Secondly, That which you pretend is falſe; for elſe, why do ſome of you hold it againſt Faith, to take or allow the *Oath of Allegiance*, others as learned and honeſt as they, that it is againſt Faith and unlawful to refuſe it and allow the refuſing of it? Why do ſome of you hold, that it is *de Fide*, that the Pope is Head of the Church by divine Law,

Law, others the contrary? Some hold it *de Fide*, that the Bleſſed Virgin was free from Actual ſin, others that it is not ſo. Some, that the *Popes* indirect power over Princes in temporalties is *de Fide* , Others the contrary. Some, that it is Univerſal Tradition, and conſequently *de Fide*, that the *Virgin Mary* was conceived in original ſin, others the contrary.

6. But what ſhall we ſay now, if you be not agreed touching your pretended means of agreement, how then can you pretend to Unity either Actual or Potential more than *Proteſtants* may? Some of you ſay, the *Pope* alone without a Council may determine all Controverſies: But others deny it. Some, that a General Council without a *Pope* may do ſo: Others deny this. Some, Both in conjunction are infallible determiners: Others again deny this. Laſtly, ſome among you, hold the Acceptation of the decrees of Councils by the Univerſal Church to be the only way to decide Controverſies: which others deny, by denying the Church to be Infallible. And indeed what way of ending Cotroverſies can this be, when either part may pretend, that they are part of the Church, and they receive not the decree, therefore the whole Church hath not received it?

7. Again, Means of agreeing differences are either Rational and well grounded and of Gods appointment, or voluntary and taken up at the pleaſure of men. Means of the former nature, we ſay, you have as little as we. For where hath God appointed, that the *Pope*, or a Council, or a Council confirmed by the *Pope*, or that Society of Chriſtians which adhere to him, ſhall be the *Infallible Judge of Controverſies*. I deſire you to ſhew any one of theſe Aſſertions plainly ſet down in Scripture, (as in all Reaſon a thing of this nature ſhould be) or at leaſt delivered with a full conſent of Fathers, or at leaſt taught in plain terms by any one Father for four Hundred years after *Chriſt*. And if you cannot do this (as I am ſure you cannot) and yet will ſtill be obtruding your ſelves upon us for our Judges, who will not cry out, *---periſſe frontem de rebus*? that you have loſt all modeſty?

8. But

8. But then for means of the other kind, ſuch as yours are, we have great abundance of them. For beſides all the ways which you have deviſed, which we may make uſe of when we pleaſe, we have a great many more, which you yet have never thought of, for which we have as good colour out of Scripture as you have for yours. For firſt, we could if we would, try it by Lots, whoſe Doctrine is true, and whoſe falſe. And you know it is written, [a] *The Lot is caſt into the Lap, but the whole diſpoſition of it is from the Lord.* 2. We could refer them to the King, and you know it is written: [b] *A Divine ſentence is in the Lips of the King, his mouth tranſgreſſeth not in judgment.* [c] *The Heart of the King is in the hand of the Lord.* We could refer the matter to any aſſembly of Chriſtians aſſembled in the name of Chriſt, ſeeing it is written, *where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midſt of them.* We may refer it to any Prieſt, becauſe it is written, [e] *The Prieſts Lips ſhall preſerve knowledge.* [f] *The Scribes and Phariſees ſit in* Moſes *Chair,* &c. To any Preacher of the Goſpel, to any Paſtor, or Doctor, for to every one of them Chriſt hath promiſed [g] *he will be with them alwaies even to the end of the World*: and of every one of them it is ſaid, [h] *He that heareth you heareth me,* &c. To any Biſhop or Prelate, for it is written, [i] *Obey your Prelates,* and again [k] *he hath given Paſtors and Doctors,* &c. *leſt we ſhould be carried about with every wind of Doctrine.* To any particular Church of Chriſtians, ſeeing it is a particular Church which is called [l] *The Houſe of God, a Pillar and ground of Truth*: and ſeeing of any particular Church it is written [m] *He that heareth not the Church let him be unto thee as a Heathen or a Publican.* We might refer it to any man that prays for Gods Spirit, for it is written, [n] *Every one that asketh receiveth*: and again, [o] *If any man want Wiſdom let him ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not.* Laſtly, we might refer it to the *Jews,* for without all doubt of them it is written, [p] *my Spirit that is in thee,* &c. All theſe means of agreement, whereof not any one but hath as much probability from Scripture,

[a] Prov. 16. 33.
[b] Prov. 16. 10.
[c] Prov. 21. 1.
[d] Mat. 18. 20.
[e] Mat. 2. 7.
[f] Mat. 25. 2.
[g] Mat. 28. 20.
[h] Luk. 10. 16.
[i] Heb. 13. 17.
[k] Eph. 4. 11.
[l] 1 Tim. 3. 15.
[m] Mat. 18. 17.
[n] Mat. 7. 8.
[o] Jam. 1. 5.
[p] Iſai. 59. 21.

pture, as that which you obtrude upon us, offer themſelves upon a ſudden to me: happily many more might be thought on, if we had time, but theſe are enough to ſhew, that would we make uſe of voluntary and deviſed means to determine differences, we had them in great abundance. And if you ſay theſe would fail us, and contradict themſelves; ſo, as we pretend, have yours. There have been *Popes* againſt *Popes*: Councils againſt Councils: Councils confirmed by *Popes*, againſt Councils confirmed by *Popes*: Laſtly, the Church of ſome Ages againſt the Church of other Ages.

9. Laſtly, whereas you find fault, *That* Proteſtants *upbraided with their diſcords, anſwer that they differ only in points not Fundamental*, I deſire you tell me whether they do ſo, or do not ſo; If they do ſo, I hope you will not find fault with the Anſwer: If you ſay they do not ſo, but in points Fundamental alſo; then they are not members of the ſame Church one with another, no more than with you: And therefore why ſhould you object to any of them, their differences from each other, any more than to your ſelves, their more and greater differences from you?

10. But *they are convinced ſometime even by their own confeſſions, that the Ancient Fathers taught divers points of Popery: and then they reply, thoſe Fathers may nevertheleſs be ſaved, becauſe thoſe Errors were not Fundamental.* And may not you alſo be convinced by the confeſſions of your own men, that the Fathers taught divers points held by *Proteſtants* againſt the Church of *Rome*, and divers againſt *Proteſtants* and the Church of *Rome*? Do not your Purging *Indexes*, clip the Tongues, and ſeal up the Lips of a great many for ſuch confeſſions? And is not the above cited confeſſion of your *Doway* Divines, plain and full to the ſame purpoſe? And do not you alſo, as freely as we, charge the Fathers with Errors, and yet ſay they were ſaved? Now what elſe do we underſtand by an *unfundamental* Error, but ſuch a one with which a man may poſſibly be ſaved? So that ſtill you proceed in condemning others for your own faults, and urging argu-

ments against us, which return more strongly upon your selves.

11. But your will is, *we should remember that Christ must always have a visible Church.* Answ. Your pleasure shall be obeyed, on condition you will not forget, that there is a difference between perpetual Visibility, and perpetual Purity. As for the answer, which you make for us, true it is, we believe the *Catholick Church cannot perish*, yet that she may, and did Err in points not Fundamental; and that *Protestants* were obliged to forsake these Errors of the Church, as they did, though not the Churh for her Errors, for that they did not, but continued still members of the Church. For it is not all one (though you perpetually confound them) *to forsake the Errors of the Church*, and to *forsake the Church*: or to *forsake the Church in her Errors*, and *simply to forsake the Church*: No more than it is for me to renounce my Brothers or my Friends Vices or Errors, and to renounce my Brother or my Friend. The former then was done by *Protestants*, the latter was not done. Nay not only not from the *Catholick*, but not so much as from the *Roman*, did they separate *per omnia*, but only in those practices which they conceived superstitious or impious. If you would at this time propose a form of Liturgy, which both Sides hold lawful, and then they would not joyn with you in this Liturgy, you might have some colour then to say, they renounce your communion absolutely. But as things are now ordered, they cannot joyn with you in prayers, but they must partake with you in unlawful practices, and for this reason, they (*not absolutely, but thus far*) separate from your communion. And this, I say, they were obliged to do under pain of damnation. *Not as if it were damnable to hold an Error not damnable*, but because it is damnable outwardly to profess and maintain it, and to joyn with others in the practice of it, when inwardly they did not hold it. Now had they continued in your communion, that they must have done, *vid.* have professed to believe and externally practised your Errors, whereof they were

were convinced that they were Errors: which though the matters of the Errors had been not neceſſary, but only profitable, whether it had not been damnable diſſimulation and Hypocriſie, I leave it to you to Judge. You your ſelf tell us within two pages after this, *that you are obliged never to ſpeak any one leaſt lie againſt your knowledge*, §, 2. now what is this but to live in a perpetual lie?

12. As for that which in the next place you ſeem ſo to wonder at, That *both* Catholicks *and* Proteſtants, *according to the opinion of* Proteſtants, *may be ſaved in their ſeveral profeſſions, becauſe forſooth, we both agree in all Fundamental points*: I Anſwer, this propoſition ſo crudely ſet down, as you have here ſet it down, I know no *Proteſtant* will juſtifie. For you ſeem to make them teach, that it is an indifferent thing, for the attainment of Salvation, whether a man believe the Truth or the Falſhood; and that they care not in whether of theſe Religions a man live or die, ſo he die in either of them: whereas all that they ſay is this, That thoſe amongſt you which want means to find the Truth and ſo die in Error, or uſe the beſt means they can with induſtry, and without partiality to find the Truth, aad yet die in Error, theſe men, thus qualified, notwithſtanding theſe Errors may be ſaved. Secondly, for thoſe that have means to find the Truth, and will not uſe them, they conceive, though their caſe be dangerous, yet if they die with a general repentance for all their ſins, known and unknown, their Salvation is not deſperate. The Truths which they hold, of Faith in Chriſt, and Repentance, being as it were an Antidote againſt their Errors, and their negligence in ſeeking the Truth. Eſpecially ſeeing by confeſſion of both ſides we agree in much more than is ſimply, and indiſpenſably neceſſary to ſalvation.

13. *Obj. But ſeeing we make ſuch various uſe of this diſtinction, is it not prodigiouſly ſtrange that we will never be induced to give in a particular Catalogue what points be Fundamental?*

Answ. And why I pray is it so *prodigiously strange* that we give no answer to an unreasonable demand? God himself hath told us, [a] *That where much is given, much shall be required; where little is given, little shall be required.* To Infants, Deaf-men, Mad-men, nothing for out we know, is given, and if it be so, of them *nothing* shall be required. Others perhaps may have means only given them to believe, [b] *That God is, and that he is a rewarder of them that seek him*; and to whom thus much only is given, to them it shall not be damnable, that they believe but only thus much. Which methinks is very manifest from the Apostle, in the *Epist. to the Heb.* where having first said, *that without Faith it is impossible to please God,* he subjoyns as his reason, *for whosoever cometh unto God, must believe that God is, and that he is a rewarder of them that seek him.* Where in my opinion, this is plainly intimated, that this is the *minimum quòd sic,* the lowest degree of Faith, wherewith, in men capable of Faith, God will be pleased: and that with this lowest degree he will be pleased, where means of rising higher are deficient. Besides, if without this belief, *that God is, and that he is a rewarder of them that seek him,* God will not be pleased, then his will is that we should believe it. Now his will it cannot be, that we should believe a falshood: It must be therefore true, that he is a rewarder of them that seek him. Now it is possible that they which never heard of Christ, may seek God, therefore it is true that even they shall please him, and be rewarded by him; I say rewarded, not with bringing them immediately to Salvation without Christ, but with bringing them according to his good pleasure, first, to Faith in Christ, and so to Salvation. To which belief the story of *Cornelius* in the 10. *chap. of the Acts* of the Apostles, and S. *Peters* Words to him, are to me a great inducement. For first it is evident he believed not in Christ, but was a meer Gentile, and one that knew not but men might be worshiped, and yet we are assured *that his Prayers and Alms* (even while he was in that state) *came up for a memorial before God; That his Prayer was heard, and his Alms had in remembrance in the sight of God.* v. 4. that upon this, *Then fearing God*

[a] Luk. 12. 48.

[b] Heb. 6. 11.

God and working righteouſneſs, (ſuch as it was) *he was accepted with God.* But how accepted? Not to be brought immediately to Salvation, but to be promoted to a higher degree of the knowledge of Gods will: For ſo it is in the 4. & 5. v. *Call for* Simon *whoſe ſirname is* Peter, *he ſhall tell thee what thou oughteſt to do,* and at the 33. verſ. *We are all here preſent before God, to hear all things that are commanded thee of God.* So that though even in his Gentiliſm, he was accepted in his preſent ſtate, yet if he had continued in it, and refuſed to believe in Chriſt after the ſufficient Revelation of the Goſpel to him, and Gods will to have him believe it, he that was accepted before, would not have continued accepted ſtill; for then that condemnation had come upon him, *than light was come unto him, and he loved Darkneſs more that Light.* So that (to proceed a ſtep farther) to whom Faith in Chriſt is ſufficiently propounded, as neceſſary to Salvation, to them it is ſimply neceſſary and Fundamental to believe in Chriſt, that is, to expect remiſſion of ſins, and Salvation from him, upon the performance of the conditions he requires; among which conditions one is, that we believe what he has revealed, when it is ſufficiently declared, to have been reveal by him: For by doing ſo, *we ſet to our Seal, that God is true, and that Chriſt was ſent by him.* Now that may be ſufficiently declared to one (all things conſidered,) which, (all things conſidered) to another is not ſufficiently declared: and conſequently that may be Fundamental and neceſſary to one, which to another is not ſo. Which Variety of circumſtances, makes it impoſſible to ſet down an exact Catalogue of Fundamentals, and proves your requeſt as reaſonable, as if you ſhould deſire us (according to the Fable) to make a Coat to fit the Moon in all her changes; or to give you a Garment that will fit all ſtatures; Or to make you a Dyal to ſerve all Meridians; or to deſign particularly, what Proviſion will ſerve an Army for a Year: whereas there may be an Army of Ten Thouſand, there may be of 100000. And therefore without ſeting down a Catalogue of Fundamentals in particular (becauſe none that can be given, can Univerſally

ſerve

serve for all men, God requiring more of them to whom he gives more, and less of them to whom he gives less) we must content our selves by a general description to tell you what is Fundamental. And to warrant us in doing so, we have your own example, §. 19. where being engaged to give us a Catalogue of Fundamentals, instead thereof you tell us only in general, *that all is Fundamental, and not to be disbelieved under pain of damnation, which the Church hath defined.* As you therefore think it enough to say in general, *that all is Fundamental which the Church has defined,* without setting down in particular a compleat Catalogue of all things, which in any Age the Church has defined (which I believe you will not undertake to do, and if you do, it will be contradicted by your Fellows:) So in reason you might think it enough for us also to say in general, *that it is sufficient for any mans Salvation, to believe that the Scripture is true, and contains all things necessary for Salvation; and to do his best endeavour to find and believe the true sense of it:* without delivering any particular Catalogue of the Fundamentals of Faith.

14. Neither *doth the want of such a Catalogue* leave us in such a *perplexed uncertainty* as you pretend. For though perhaps we cannot exactly distinguish in the Scripture, what *is revealed because it is necessary,* from what is *necessary consequently and accidentally, meerly because it is revealed:* yet we are sure enough, that all that is necessary any way is there, and therefore in believing all that is there, we are sure to believe all that is necessary. And if we Err from the true and intended sense of some, nay of many obscure or ambiguous Texts of Scripture, yet we may be sure enough, that we Err not damnably: because, if we do indeed desire and endeavour to find the Truth, we may be sure we do so, and as sure that it cannot consist with the revealed goodness of God, to damn him for Error, that desires and indeavours to find the Truth.

15. Ad §. 2.] The effect of this Paragraph (for as much as concerns us) is this, *that for any man to deny belief*

to

to any one thing be it great or ſmall known by him, to be revealed by Almighty God for a truth, is in effect to charge God with falſhood : for it is to ſay that God affirms that to be Truth, which he either knows to be not a Truth, or which he doth not know to be a Truth : and therefore without all Controverſie this is a damnable ſin. To this I ſubſcribe with Hand and Heart : adding withal, that not only he which knows, but he which believes (nay though it be erroneouſly) any thing to be revealed by God, and yet will not believe it, nor aſſent unto it, is in the ſame caſe, and commits the ſame ſin of derogation from Gods moſt perfect and pure Veracity.

16. Ad §. 3.] I ſaid purpoſely *(known by himſelf, and believes himſelf)* For as, without any diſparagement of a mans Honeſty, I may believe ſomething to be falſe, which he affirms, of his certain knowledge to be true, provided I neither know nor believe that he has ſo affirmed : So without any the leaſt diſhonour to Gods Eternal never failing Veracity, I may doubt of, or deny ſome truth revealed by him, if I neither know nor believe it to be revealed by him.

19. But *ignorance of what we are expreſly bound to know, is it ſelf a fault, and therefore cannot be an excuſe :* and therefore if you could ſhew the *Proteſtants* differ in thoſe points, the truth whereof (which can be but one) they were bound expreſly to know, I ſhould eaſily yield that one ſide muſt of neceſſity be in a mortal Crime. But for want of proof of this, you content your ſelf only to ſay it ; and therefore I alſo might be contented only to deny it, yet I will not, but give a reaſon for my denial. And my reaſon is, becauſe our obligation expreſly to know any Divine Truth, muſt ariſe from Gods manifeſt revealing of it, and his revealing unto us that he has revealed it, and that his will is, we ſhould believe it : Now in the points controverted among *Proteſtants*, he hath not ſo dealt with us, therefore he hath not laid any ſuch obligation upon us. The major of this Syllogiſm is evident, and therefore I will not ſtand to prove it. The minor alſo will be evident to him that con-

considers, that in all the Controversies of *Protestants*, there is a seeming conflict of Scripture with Scripture, Reason with Reason, Authority with Authority: which how it can consist with the manifest revealing of the truth of either Side, I cannot well understand. Besides, though we grant that Scripture, Reason and Authority, were all on one side, and the apparences of the other side all answerable: yet if we consider the strange power that education and prejudices instilled by it, have over even excellent understandings, we may well imagine, that many truths which in themselves are revealed plainly enough, are yet to such or such a man, prepossest with contrary opinions, not revealed plainly. Neither doubt I but God, who knows whereof we are made, and what passions we are subject unto, will compassionate such infirmities, and not enter into judgment with us for those things, which, all things considered, were unavoidable.

20. Obj. *But till Fundamentals* (say you) *be sufficiently proposed* (*as revealed by God*) *it is not against Faith to reject them*; *or rather it is not possible prudently to believe them: And points unfundamental being thus sufficiently proposed as divine Truths, may not be denied*; *Therefore you conclude there is no difference between them: Answ.* A Circumstantial point, may by accident become Fundamental, because it may be so proposed that the denial of it, will draw after it the denial of this Fundamental truth, *that all which God says is true.* Notwithstanding in themselves there is a main difference between them: *Points Fundamental being those only which are revealed by God, and commanded to be Preach'd to all, and believed by all. Points circumstantial being such, as though God hath revealed them, yet the Pastors of the Church are not bound under pain of Damnation particularly to teach them unto all men every where, and the People may be securely ig-norant of them.*

21. *Obj.* You say, *Not Erring in points Fundamental, is not sufficient for the preservation of the Church*; *because any Error maintained by it against Gods Revelation is destructive.* I answer. If you mean against Gods Revelation known by

by the Church to be so, it is true; but impossible that the Church should do so, for *ipso Facto* in doing it, it were a Church no longer. But if you mean against some Revelation, which the Church by error thinks to be no Revelation, it is false. The Church may ignorantly disbelieve such a Revelation, and yet continue a Church; which thus I prove. That the Gospel was to be preached to all Nations, was a Truth revealed before our Saviours Ascension, in these words, *Go and teach all Nations. Mat.* 29. 19. Yet through prejudice or inadvertence, or some other cause, the Church disbelieved it, as it is apparent out of the 11. and 12. Chap. of the *Acts*, until the conversion of *Cornelius*, and yet was still a Church. Therefore to disbelieve some divine Revelation, not knowing it to be so, is not destructive of salvation, or of the being of the Church. Again, It is a plain Revelation of God, that [a] the Sacrament of the Eucharist *should be administred in both kinds*: and [b] that the publick Hymns and *Prayers of the Church should be in such a language as is most for edification*; yet these Revelations the Church of *Rome* not seeing, by reason of the veil before their eyes, their Churches supposed infallibility, I hope the denial of them shall not be laid to their charge, no otherwise than as *building hay and stubble on the Foundations, not overthrowing the Foundation it self.*

[a] 1 Cor. 11. 2.

[b] 1 Cor. 14, 15, 16. 26.

24. Ad §. 5. This Paragraph, if it be brought out of the Clouds, will I believe have in it these Propositions. 1. *Things are distinguished by their different natures.* 2. *The Nature of Faith is taken, not from the matter believed, for then they that believed different matters should have different Faiths, but from the Motive to it.* 3. *This Motive is Gods Revelation.* 4. *This Revelation is alike for all objects.* 5. *Protestants disagree in things equally revealed by God: Therefore they forsake the formal motive of Faith: and therefore have no faith nor unity therein.* Which is truly a very proper and convenient argument to close up a weak discourse, wherein both the Propositions are false for matter, confused and disordered for the form, and the conclusion utterly inconsequent. First for the second Proposition, who knows not that the Essence of all Habits (and therefore of Faith

among the reſt) is taken from their Act, and their Object? If the Habit be general, from the Act and Object in general, if the Habit be ſpecial, from the Act and Object in ſpecial. Then for the motive to a thing, that it cannot be of the Eſſence of the thing to which it moves, who can doubt, that knows that a motive is an efficient cauſe: and that the efficient is always extrinſecal to the effect? For the fourth, that *Gods Revelation is alike for all Objects*, It is ambiguous: and if the ſenſe of it be, that his Revelation is an equal Motive to induce us to believe all objects revealed by him, it is true, but impertinent: If the ſenſe of it be, that all objects revealed by God are alike (that is, alike plainly and undoubtedly) revealed by him, it is pertinent, but moſt untrue. Witneſs the great diverſity of Texts of Scripture, whereof ſome are ſo plain and evident, that no man of ordinary ſenſe can miſtake the ſenſe of them. Some are ſo obſcure and ambiguous, that to ſay this or this is the certain ſenſe of them, were high preſumption. For the 5. *Proteſtants diſagree in things equally revealed by God!* In themſelves perhaps, but not equally to them: whoſe underſtandings by reaſon of their different Educations are faſhioned, and ſhaped for the entertainment of various Opinions, and conſequently ſome of them, more inclined to believe ſuch a ſenſe of Scripture, others to believe another; which to ſay that God will not take into his conſideration in judging mens Opinions, is to diſparage his goodneſs. But to what purpoſe is it, that theſe things are equally revealed to both, (as the light is equally revealed to all blind men,) if they be not fully revealed to either? The ſenſe of this Scripture, *Why are they then baptized for the dead?* and this, *He ſhall be ſaved, yet ſo as by fire*, and a thouſand others, is equally revealed to you and to another interpreter, that is certainly to neither. He now conceives one ſenſe of them, and you another; and would it not be an excellent inference, if I ſhould conclude now as you do; That you forſake the formal motive of Faith, which is Gods Revelation, and conſequently loſe all faith and unity therein? So likewiſe the *Jeſuits* and *Dominicans*, the *Franciſcans* and *Dominicans* diſagree about things equally

equally revealed by Almighty God: and seeing they do so, I beseech you let me understand, why this reason will not exclude them as well as Protestants *from all faith and unity therein?* Thus you have failed of your undertaking in your first part of your Title, and that is a very ill *omen*, especially in points of so streight mutual dependance, that we shall have but slender performance in your second assumpt. Which is, *That the Church is Infallible in all her Definitions, whether concerning points Fundamental, or not Fundamental.*

26. Ad §. 9. 10, 11. I grant that the Church *cannot without damnable sin, either deny any thing to be true, which she knows to be Gods truth:* or propose *any thing as his truth, which she knows not to be so.* But that she may not do this by ignorance or mistake, and so without damnable sin, that you should have proved, but have not. But, say you *this excuse cannot serve: for if the Church be assisted only for points fundamental, she cannot but know that she may err in points not fundamental.* Ans. It does not follow, unless you suppose, that the Church knows that she is assisted no farther. But if, being assisted only so far, she yet did conceive by error her assistance absolute and unlimited, or if knowing her assistance restrained to fundamentals, she yet conceived by error, that she should be guarded, from proposing any thing but what was fundamental, then the consequence is apparently false. *But at least she cannot be certain that she cannot err, and therefore cannot be excused from headlong and pernicious temerity in proposing points not fundamental, to be believed by Christians as matters of Faith.* Ans. Neither is this destruction worth any thing; unless it be understood of such fundamental points, as she is not warranted to propose by evident Text of Scripture. Indeed if she propose such, as *matters of Faith certainly true*, she may well be questioned, *Quo Warranto?* She builds without a foundation, and *says thus saith the Lord, when the Lord doth not say so:* which cannot be excused from rashness and high presumption; such a presumption, as an Embassador should commit, who should say in his Masters name that for which he hath no commission. Of the same

nature, I say, but of a higher strain: as much as the King of Heaven, is greater than any earthly King. But though she may err in some points not fundamental, yet may she have certainty enough in proposing others; as for example, these, *That Abraham begat Isaac*, that S. *Paul had a Cloak*, that *Timothy was sick*; because these, though not fundamental, *i. e.* no essential parts of Christianity, yet are evidently, and undeniably set down in Scripture, and consequently, may be without all rashness proposed by the Church as certain divine Revelations. Neither is your Argument concluding when you say, *If in such things she may be deceived, she must be always uncertain of all such things.* For my sense may sometimes possibly deceive me, yet I am certain enough that I see what I see, and feel what I feel. Our Judges are not infallible in their judgments, yet are they certain enough, that they judge aright, and that they proceed according to the evidence that is given, when they condemn a Thief, or a Murderer to the Gallows. A Traveller is not always certain of his way, but often mistaken; and does it therefore follow that he can have no assurance that *Charing-Cross* is his right way from the *Temple* to *White-Hall*? The ground of your error here, is your not distinguishing, between actual certainty and absolute infallibillty. Geometricians are not infallible in their own Science: yet they are very certain of those things, which they see demonstrated. And Carpenters are not infallible, yet certain of the straightness of those things which agree with their Rule and Square. So though the Church be not infallibly certain, that in all her definitions, whereof some are about disputable and ambiguous matters, she shall proceed according to her Rule, yet being certain of the infallibility of her Rule, and that in this or that thing she doth manifestly proceed according to it, she may be certain of the Truth of some particular Decrees, and yet not certain that she shall never decree but what is true.

27. Ad §. 12. Obj. *But if the Church may err in points not fundamental, she may err in proposing Scripture, and so we cannot be assured whether she have not been deceived already.*

Ans.

Anſ. The Church may err in her propoſition or cuſtody of the Canon of Scripture, if you underſtand by the Church, any preſent Church of one denomination, for example, the *Roman*, the *Greek*, or ſo. Yet have we ſufficient certainty of Scripture, not from the bare teſtimony of any preſent Church, but from Univerſal Tradition, of which the teſtimony of any preſent Church is but a little part. So that here you fall into the Fallacy, *à dicto ſecundum quid ad dictum ſimpliciter.* For in effect this is the ſenſe of your Argument: Unleſs the Church be infallible, we can have no certainty of Scripture from the authority of the Church: Therefore unleſs the Church be infallible, we can have no certainty hereof at all. As if a man ſhould ſay; If the Vintage of *France* miſcarry, we can have no Wine from *France*: Therefore if that Vintage miſcarry we can have no Wine at all. And for the incorruption of Scripture, I know no other rational aſſurance we can have of it, than ſuch as we have of the incorruption of other ancient Books, that is, the conſent of ancient Copies: ſuch I mean *for the kind*, though it be far *greater for the degree of it.* And if the Spirit of God give any man any other aſſurance hereof, this is not rational and diſcurſive, but ſupernatural and infuſed. An aſſurance it may be to himſelf, but no argument to another. As for the Infallibility of the Church, it is ſo far from being a proof of the Scriptures incorruption, that no proof can be pretended for it, but incorrupted places of Scripture: which yet are as ſubject to corruption as any other, and more likely to have been corrupted (if it had been poſſible) than any other, and made to ſpeak as they do, for the advantage of thoſe men, whoſe ambition it hath been a long time, to bring all under their authority. Now then, if any man ſhould prove the Scriptures uncorrupted, becauſe the Church ſays ſo which is infallible: I would demand again touching this very thing, that there is an infallible Church, ſeeing it is not of it ſelf evident, how ſhall I be aſſured of it? And what can he anſwer, but that the Scripture ſays ſo in theſe and theſe places? Hereupon I would ask him, how ſhall I be aſſured, that the Scriptures

are

are incorrupted in those places? seeing it is possible, and not altogether improbable, that these men, which desire to be thought infallible, when they had the government of all things in their own hands, may have altered them for their purpose. If to this he answer again, that the Church is infallible, and therefore cannot do so. I hope it would be apparent, that he runs round in a circle, and proves the Scriptures incorruption, by the Churches infallibility, and the Churches infallibility by the Scriptures incorruption, and that is in effect the Churches infallibility, by the Churches infallibility, and the Scriptures incorruption by the Scriptures incorruption.

28. Now for your observation, that *some Books, which were not always known to be Canonical, have been afterwards received for such. But never any book or syllable defined for Canonical, was afterwards questioned or rejected for Apocryphal:* I demand, touching the first sort, whether they were commended to the Church by the Apostles as Canonical or not? If not, seeing the whole Faith was preached by the Apostles to the Church, and seeing after the Apostles, the Church pretends to no new Revelations, how can it be an Article of Faith to believe them Canonical? And how can you pretend, that your Church which makes this an Article of Faith, is so assisted as not to propose any thing as a divine Truth which is not revealed by God? If they were, how then is the Church an infallible keeper of the Canon of Scripture, which hath suffered some Books of Canonical Scripture, to be lost? and others to lose for a long time their being Canonical, at least, the necessity of being so esteemed, and afterwards, as it were by the law of *Postliminium* hath restored their Authority and Canonicalness unto them? If this was delivered by the Apostles to the Church, the point was sufficiently discussed, and therefore your Churches omission to teach it for some ages, as an article of faith, nay degrading it from the number of articles of faith, and putting it among disputable problems, was surely not very laudable. If it were not revealed by God to the Apostles, and by the Apostles to the Church, then can it be no Revelation, and therefore

fore her presumption in proposing it as such, is inexcusable.

29. And then for the other part of it, *that never any book or syllable defined for Canonical, was afterwards questioned or rejected for Apocryphal:* Certainly it is a bold asseveration, but extreamly false. For I demand; The Book of *Ecclesiasticus* and *Wisdom*, the *Epistle of* S. *James*, and *to the Hebrews*, were they by the Apostles approved for Canonical, or no? If not, with what face dare you approve them, and yet pretend that all your doctrin is Apostolical? Especially seeing it is evident that this point is not deducible by rational discourse from any other defined by them. If they were approved by them, this I hope was a sufficient definition: and therefore you were best rub your forehead hard, and say, that these Books were never questioned. But if you do so, then I shall be bold to ask you, what Books you meant in saying before, *Some Books which were not always known to be Canonical, have been afterwards received?* Then for the Book of *Macchabes*, I hope you will say, it was defined for Canonical before S. *Gregories* time: and yet he, lib. 19. Moral, c. 13. citing a testimony out of it, prefaceth to it after this matter, *Concerning which matter we do not amiss if we produce a testimony out of Books although not Canonical, yet set forth, for the edification of the Church. For Eleazar in the Book of Machabees*, &c. Which if it be not to reject it from being Canonical, is without question, at least to question it. Moreover, because you are so punctual, as to talk of words and syllables, I would know whether before *Sixtus Quintus* his time, your Church had a defined Canon of Scripture, or not? If not, then was your Church surely a most vigilant keeper of Scripture, that for 1500. years had not defined what was Scripture, and what was not. If it had, then I demand, was it *that*, set forth by *Sixtus*, or *that*, set forth by *Clement*, or a *third* different from both? If it were that set forth by *Sixtus*, then is it now condemned by *Clement*: if that of *Clement*, it was condemned I say, but sure you will say contradicted and questioned by *Sixtus*; If different from both, then was it questioned and condemned by

by both, and still lies under the condemnation. But then lastly, suppose it had been true, *That both some Book not known to be Canonical had been received*, and that *never any after receiving had been questioned:* How had this been a sign that the Church is infallibly assisted by the Holy Ghost? In what mood or figure, would this conclusion follow out of these Premises? Certainly your flying to such poor signs, as these are, is to me a great sign, that you labour with penury of better arguments: and that, thus to catch at shadows and bulrushes, is a shrewd sign of a sinking cause.

30. Ad §. 13. We are told here, *That the general promises of Infallibility to the Church, must not be restrained only to points fundamental: Because then the Apostles words and writings may also be so restrained.*

Ans. This also may be done, but if it be done, may easily be confuted. It is done to our hand in this very Paragraph, by five words taken out of Scripture, *All Scripture is divinely inspired.* Shew but as much for the Church: Shew where it is written, *That all the decrees of the Church are divinely inspired*; and the Controversie will be at an end. Besides, there is not the same reason for the Churches absolute Infallibility, as for the Apostles and Scriptures. For if the Church fall into error, it may be reformed by comparing it with the rule of the Apostles doctrine and Scripture. But if the Apostles have erred in delivering the doctrine of Christianity, to whom shall we have recourse, for the discovering and correcting their error? Again, there is not so much strength required in the Edifice as in the Foundation: and if but wise men have the ordering of the building, they will make it much a surer thing, that the foundation shall not fail the building, than that the building shall not fall from the foundation. And though the building be to be of Brick or Stone, and perhaps of Wood, yet if it may be possibly, they will have a Rock for their foundation, whose stability is a much more indubitable thing, than the adherence of the structure to it. Now the Apostles and Prophets, and Canonical Writers, are the foundation of the Church, according to that of S. *Paul*,

built

built upon the foundation of Apoſtles and Prophets; therefore their ſtability, in reaſon ought to be greater than the Churches, which is built upon them. Again, a dependent Infallibility (eſpecially if the dependence be voluntary) cannot be ſo certain, as that on which it depends: But the Infallibility of the Church, depends upon the Infallibility of the Apoſtles, and the ſtreightneſs of the thing regulated, upon the ſtreightneſs of the Rule: and beſides this dependence is voluntary, for it is in the power of the Church to deviate from this Rule; being nothing elſe but an aggregation of men, of which every one has free will, and is ſubject to paſſions and error: Therefore the Churches infallibility, is not ſo certain as that of the Apoſtles.

31. Laſtly, *Quid verba audiam, cum facta videam?* If you be ſo infallible as the Apoſtles were, ſhew it as the Apoſtles did; *They went forth* (ſaith S. *Mark*) *and Preached every where, the Lord working with them, and confirming their words with Signs following.* It is impoſſible that God ſhould lie, and that the eternal Truth ſhould ſet his hand and ſeal to the confirmation of a falſhood, or of ſuch Doctrin as is partly true and partly falſe. The Apoſtles Doctrin was thus confirmed, therefore it was intirely true, and in no part either falſe or uncertain. I ſay in no part of that which they delivered conſtantly, as a certain divine Truth, and which had the Atteſtation of Divine Miracles. For that the Apoſtles themſelves, even after the ſending of the Holy Ghoſt, were, and through inadvertence or prejudice, continued for a time in an error, repugnant to a revealed Truth, it is as I have already noted unanſwerably evident, from the *ſtory of the Acts of the Apoſtles.* For notwithſtanding our Saviours expreſs warrant and injunction, *to go and preach to all Nations,* yet until S. *Peter* was better informed by a viſion from Heaven, and by the converſion of *Cornelius*, both he and the reſt of the Church, held it unlawful for them, to go or preach the Goſpel to any but the Jews.

32. And for thoſe things which they profeſs to deliver as the dictates of human reaſon and prudence, and not as divine Revelations, why we ſhould take them to be divine

revelations, I see no reason; nor how we can do so, and not contradict the Apostles, and God himself. Therefore when S. *Paul* says, in the first Epistle to the *Corinth.* 7. 12. *To the rest speak I, not the Lord*; And again, *concerning Virgins I have no commandment of the Lord, but I deliver my Judgment:* If we will pretend, that the Lord did certainly speak, what S. *Paul* spake, and that his judgment was Gods commandment, shall we not plainly contradict S. *Paul*, and that spirit by which he wrote? which moved him to Write, as in other places divine Revelations, which he certainly knew to be such, so in this place, his own judgment, touching some things which God had not particularly revealed unto him.

34. Obj. *But if the Apostles were Infallible, in all things proposed by them as divine Truths, the like must be affirmed of the Church, because* Protestants *teach the promise (of leading into all Truth) to be verified in the Church.*

Ans. It's true that to the Apostles the promise was made, and to them only, yet the words are true also of the Church. But they agree to the Apostles *in a higher*, to the Church *in a lower* sense: to the Apostles *in more absolute*, to the Church in *a more limited* sense. To the Apostles *absolutely*, for the *Churches direction:* to the Church *Conditionally by adherence to that direction, and so far as she doth adhere to it.* In a word, the Apostles were led into all Truths by the Spirit, *efficaciter:* The Church is led also into all Truth by the Apostles *writings, sufficienter.* So that the Apostles and the Church, may be fitly compared to the Star and the Wisemen. The Star was directed by the finger of God, and could not but go right to the place where Christ was: But the Wisemen were led by the Star to Christ; led by it, I say, not *efficaciter*, or *irresistibiliter*, but *sufficienter*, so that if they would they might follow it, if they would not, they might choose. So was it between the Apostles writing Scriptures, and the Church. They in their writing were infallibly assisted to propose nothing as a divine Truth, but what was so. The Church is also led into all Truth, but it is by the intervening of the Apostles writings: But it is, as the Wisemen were led by the Star,

Star, or as a Traveller is directed by a Mercurial Statue, or as a Pilot by his Card and Compaſs: led ſufficiently, but not irreſiſtibly: led ſo that ſhe may follow, not ſo that ſhe muſt. For ſeeing the Church is a ſociety of men, whereof every one (according to the Doctrine of the *Romiſh* Church) hath free-will in believing, it follows, that the whole aggregate has free-will in believing. And if any man ſay that at leaſt *it is morally impoſſible, that of ſo many whereof all may believe aright, not any ſhould do ſo:* I anſwer, It is true, if they did all give themſelves any liberty of judgment. But if all (as the caſe is here) captivate their underſtandings to one of them, all are as likely to err as that one. And he more likely to err than any other, becauſe he may err and thinks he cannot, and becauſe he conceives the Spirit abſolutely promiſed to the ſucceſſion of Biſhops, of which many have been notoriouſly and confeſſedly wicked men, *Men of the World:* whereas this Spirit is the *Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receive, becauſe he ſeeth him not, neither knoweth him.*

38. Ad §. 16. To this Paragraph, which pretends to ſhew, *that if the Catholick Church be fallible in ſome points, it follows, that no true Proteſtant can with aſſurance believe the Univerſal Church in any one point of Doctrin.*

I *Anſwer.* Though the Church being not Infallible, I cannot believe her in every thing ſhe ſays, yet I can and muſt believe her in every thing ſhe proves, either by Scripture, Reaſon, or Univerſal Tradition, be it Fundamental, or be it not Fundamental. This you ſay, we *cannot, in points not Fundamental, becauſe in ſuch we believe ſhe may err.* But this I know, we can: becauſe though ſhe may err in ſome things, yet ſhe does not err in what ſhe proves, though it be not Fundamental. Again you ſay, *we cannot do it in Fundamentals, becauſe we muſt know what points be Fundamental, before we go to learn of her.* Not ſo, but I muſt learn of the Church, or of ſome part of the Church, or I cannot know any thing Fundamental or not Fundamental. For how can I come to know, that there was ſuch a Man as Chriſt, that he taught ſuch

Doctrin, that he and his Apoſtles did ſuch miracles in confirmation of it, that the Scripture is Gods Word, unleſs I be taught it. So then the Church is, though *not a certain Foundation and proof of my Faith, yet a neceſſary introduction to it.*

39. But the *Churches infallible direction, extending only to Fundamentals, unleß I know them before I go to learn of her, I may be rather deluded than inſtructed by her.* The reaſon and connexion of this conſequence, I fear neither I nor you do well underſtand. And beſides I muſt tell you, you are too bold in taking that which no man grants you, *that the Church is an infallible directer in Fundamentals.* For if ſhe were ſo, then muſt we not only learn Fundamentals of her, but alſo *learn of her what is fundamental, and take all for fundamental which ſhe delivers to be ſuch.* In the performance whereof, if I knew any one Church to be infallible, I would quickly be of that Church. But good Sir, you muſt needs do us this favor, to be ſo acute, as to diſtinguiſh between, being *infallible in fundamentals*, and being an *infallible guide in fundamentals.* That there ſhall be always *a Church infallible in fundamentals*, we eaſily grant; for it comes to no more but this, *that there ſhall be always a Church.* But that there ſhall be always ſuch a Church, which is an infallible Guide in fundamentals, this we deny. For this cannot be without ſetling a known infallibility in ſome one known ſociety of Chriſtians, (as the *Greek* or the *Roman*, or ſome other Church) by adhering to which Guide, men might be guided to believe aright in all Fundamentals. A man that were deſtitute of all means of communicating his thoughts to others, might yet in himſelf, and to himſelf be infallible, but he could not be a Guide to others. A man or a Church that were inviſible, ſo that none could know how to repair to it for direction, could not be an infallible guide, and yet he might be in himſelf infallible. You ſee then there is a wide difference between theſe two, and therefore I muſt beſeech you not to confound them, nor to take the one for the other.

40. But they that *know what points are Fundamental, otherwiſe than by the Churches authority, learn not of the Church:*

Yes,

Yes, they may learn of the Church, that the Scripture is the word of God, and from the Scripture, that ſuch points are fundamental, others are not ſo; and conſequently learn, even of the Church, even of your Church, that all is not fundamental, nay all is not true, which the Church teacheth to be ſo. Neither do I ſee what hinders, but a man may learn of a Church, how to confute the Errors of that Church which taught him: as well as of my Maſter in Phyſick, or the Mathematicks, I may learn thoſe rules and principles, by which I may confute my Maſters erroneous concluſions.

41. But you ask, *If the Church be not an infallible teacher, why are we commanded to hear, to ſeek, to obey the Church?* I Anſwer. For commands *to ſeek the Church,* I have not yet met with any, and I believe you, if you were to ſhew them, would be your ſelf to ſeek. But yet if you could produce ſome ſuch, we might ſeek the Church to many good purpoſes, without ſuppoſing her *a Guide infallible.* And then for *hearing and obeying the Church,* I would fain know, whether none may be heard and obeyed, but thoſe that are infallible? Whether particular Churches, Governors, Paſtors, Parents, be not to be heard and obeyed? Or whether all theſe be Infallible? I wonder you will thruſt upon us ſo often, theſe worn-out Objections, without taking notice of their Anſwers.

42. Your Argument from S. *Auſtine's* firſt place, is a fallacy, *A dicto ſecundum quid ad dictum ſimpliciter.* If the *whole Church practiſe any of theſe things (matters of order and decency,* for ſuch only there he ſpeaks of,*) to diſpute whether that ought to be done, is inſolent madneſs.* And from hence you infer, *If the whole Church practiſe any thing, to diſpute whether it ought to be done, is inſolent madneſs.* As if there were no difference between *any thing, and any of theſe things?* Or as if I might not eſteem it pride and folly, to contradict and diſturb the Church for matter of order, pertaining to the time and place, and other circumſtances of Gods worſhip; and yet account it neither pride nor folly, to go about to reform ſome errors, which the Church hath ſuffered to come in, and to vitiate the very

ſubſtance

substance of Gods worship. It was a practice of the whole Church in Saint *Austines* time, and esteemed an Apostolick Tradition, even by Saint *Austine* himself, *That the Eucharist should be administred to Infants:* Tell me Sir, I beseech you; Had it been insolent madness to dispute against this practice, or had it not? If it had, how insolent and mad are you, that have not only disputed against it, but utterly abolished it? If it had not, then as I say, you must understand Saint *Austines* words, not simply of all things, but (as indeed he himself restrained them) *of these things, of matter of Order, Decency, and Uniformity.*

44. Obj. But the Doctrines, that *Infants are to be baptized, and those that are baptized by Hereticks, are not to be rebaptized, are neither of them to be proved by Scripture: And yet according to* S. *Austine they are true Doctrins, and we may be certain of them upon the Authority of the Church, which we could not be, unless the Church were Infallible*; *therefore the Church is Infallible.* I answer, that there is no repugnance but we may be certain enough, of the Universal Traditions of the ancient Church, such as in S. *Austin*'s account, these were which here are spoken of, and yet not be certain enough, of the definitions of the present Church. Unless you can shew (which I am sure you can never do) that the Infallibility of the present Church, was always a Tradition of the ancient Church. Now your main business is to prove the present Church Infallible, not so much in consigning ancient Traditions, as in defining emergent controversies. Again, it follows not, because the Churches Authority, is warrant enough for us to believe some Doctrin, touching which the Scripture is silent, therefore it is Warrant enough to believe these, to which the Scripture seems repugnant. Now the Doctrins which S. *Austin* received upon the Churches Authority, were of the first sort; the Doctrins for which we deny your Churches Infallibility are of the second. And therefore though the Churches Authority, might be strong enough, to bear the weight which S. *Austin* laid upon it, yet happily it may not be strong enough, to bear that which

which you lay upon it. Though it may ſupport ſome Doctrines without Scripture, yet ſurely not againſt it. And laſt of all, to deal ingeniouſly with you and the world, I am not ſuch an Idolater of S. *Auſtin*, as to think a thing proved ſufficiently becauſe he ſays it, nor that all his ſentences are Oracles; and particularly in this thing, that whatſoever was practiſed or held by the Univerſal Church of his time, muſt needs have come from the Apoſtles. Though conſidering the nearneſs of his time to the Apoſtles, I think it a good probable way, and therefore am apt enough to follow it, when I ſee no reaſon to the contrary. Yet I profeſs I muſt have better ſatisfaction, before I can induce my ſelf to hold it certain and infallible. And this, not becauſe *Popery* would come in at this door, as ſome have vainly feared, but becauſe by the Church Univerſal of ſome time, and the Church Univerſal of other times, I ſee plain contradictions held and practiſed. Both which could not come from the Apoſtles, for then the Apoſtles had been teachers of falſehood. And therefore the belief or practice of the preſent Univerſal Church, can be no infallible proof, that the Doctrin ſo believed, or the cuſtom ſo practiſed came from the Apoſtles. I inſtance in the Doctrine of the *Millenaries*, and the *Euchariſts neceſſity for Infants:* both which Doctrines have been taught by the conſent of the eminent Fathers of ſome ages, without any oppoſition from any of their Contemporaries: and were delivered by them, not as Doctors, but as Witneſſes, not as their own Opinions, but as Apoſtolick Traditions. And therefore meaſuring the Doctrin of the Church by all the Rules which Cardinal *Perron* gives us for that purpoſe, both theſe Doctrines muſt be acknowledged to have been the Doctrines of the Ancient Church of ſome age, or ages; And that the contrary Doctrines were Catholick at ſome other time, I believe you will not think it needful for me to prove. So that either I muſt ſay, the Apoſtles were fountains of contradictious Doctrines, or that being the Univerſal Doctrine of the preſent Church, is no ſufficient proof that it came originally from the Apoſtles. Beſides,

sides, who can warrant us, that the Universal Traditions of the Church were all Apostolical? seeing in that famous place for Traditions, in *Tertullian*, [a] *Quicunque traditor*, any Author whatsoever is founder good enough for them. And who can secure us, that Humane inventions, and such as came *à quocunque Traditore*, might not in a short time, gain the reputation of Apostolick! Seeing the direction then was, [b] *Precepta majorum Apostolicas Traditiones quisque existimat.*

[a] *De Corona Militis*, c 3. & 4. Where having recounted sundry unwritten Traditions then observed by Christians, many whereof, by the way, (notwithstanding the Council of *Trents* profession, *to receive them and the written Word with the like affection of Piety*) are now rejected and neglected by the Church of *Rome*: For example *Immersion in Baptism*; *Tasting a mixture of Milk and Honey presently after*; *Abstaining from Bathes for a week after*; *Accounting it an impiety to pray kneeling on the Lords day, or between Easter and Pentecost*: I say, having reckoned up these and other Traditions in the 3. *chap.* He adds another in the fourth, of *the Veiling of Women*; And then adds, *Since I find no law for this, it follows that Tradition must have given this observation to custom, which shall gain in time, Apostolick authority by the interpretation of the reason of it. By these examples therefore it is declared, that the observing of unwritten Tradition, being confirmed by custom, may be defended. The perseverance of the observation being a good testimony of the goodness of the Tradition. Now custom even in civil affairs where a law is wanting, passes for a law. Neither is it material whether it be grounded on Scripture, or reason; seeing reason is commendation enough for a law. Moreover if law be grounded on reason, all that must be law, which is so grounded.*— A quocunque productum——*Whosoever is the producer of it. Do ye think it is not lawful*, Omni fideli, *for every faithful man to conceive and constitute? Provided he constitute only what is not repugnant to Gods will, what is conducible for discipline and available to salvation? seeing the Lord says, why even of our selves, judge ye not what is right? And a little after, This reason now demand, saving the respect of the Tradition,*—— A quocunque Traditore censetur, nec auctorem respiciens sed Auctoritatem; *From whatsoever Traditor it comes; neither regard the Author but the Authority.* [b] Hier.

46. But let us see what S. *Chrysostom* says, *They (the Apostles) delivered not all things in writing* (who denies it?) *but many things also without writing*, (who doubts of it?) *and these also are worthy of belief.* Yes, if we knew what they were. But many things are worthy of belief, which are not necessary to be believed: As that *Julius Cæsar* was Emperor of *Rome* is a thing worthy of belief, being so well testified as it is, but yet it is not necessary to be believed; a man may be saved without it. Those many works which *our Saviour did (which S.* John *supposes, would not have*

have been contained in a World of Books) if they had been written, or if God by ſome other means had preſerved the knowledge of them, had been as worthy to be believed, and as neceſſary as thoſe that are written. But to ſhew you how much a more faithful keeper Records are than report, thoſe few that were written are preſerved and believed, thoſe infinity more that were not written, are all loſt and vaniſhed out of the memory of men. And ſeeing God in his providence, hath not thought fit to preſerve the memory of them, he hath freed us from the obligation of believing them: for every obligation ceaſes, when it becomes impoſſible. Who can doubt but the Primitive Chriſtians, to whom the Epiſtles of the Apoſtles were written, either of themſelves underſtood, or were inſtructed by the Apoſtles, touching the ſenſe of the obſcure places of them? Theſe Traditive interpretations, had they been written and diſperſed, as the Scriptures were, had without queſtion been preſerved, as the Scriptures are. But to ſhew how excellent a Keeper of the Tradition, the Church of *Rome* hath been, or even the Catholick Church, for want of writing they are all loſt, nay were all loſt, within a few Ages after Chriſt. So that if we conſult the Ancient Interpreters, we ſhall hardly find any two of them agree about the ſenſe of any one of them. *Cardinal Perron,* in his diſcourſe of Traditions, having alledged this place for them, *Hold the Traditions,* &c. tell us we *muſt not anſwer, that S.* Paul *ſpeaks here, only of ſuch Traditions, which (though not in this Epiſt. to the* Theſſalonians) *yet were afterwards written, and in other Books of Scripture: becauſe it is upon occaſion of Tradition* (touching the *cauſe* of the *hinderance of the coming of* Antichriſt,) *which was never written, that he lays this injunction upon them, to hold the Traditions.* Well, let us grant this Argument good, and concluding; and that the Church of the *Theſſalonians,* or the Catholick Church (for what S. *Paul* writ to one Church he writ to all,) were to hold ſome unwritten Traditions, and among the reſt, what was the cauſe of the hinderance of the coming of *Antichriſt.* But what if they did not perform

their duty in this point, but suffered this Tradition to be lost out of the memory of the Church? Shall we not conclude, that seeing God would not suffer any thing necessary to Salvation to be lost, and he has suffered this Tradition to be lost, therefore the knowledge or belief of it, though it were a profitable thing, yet it was not necessary? I hope you will not challenge such authority over us, as to oblige us to impossibilities, to do that which you cannot do your selves. It is therefore requisite that you make this command possible to be obeyed, before you require obedience unto it. Are you able then to instruct us so well, as to be fit to say unto us, *Now ye know what withholdeth*? Or do you your selves know that ye may instruct us? Can ye, or dare you say, this or this was this hindrance which S. *Paul* here meant, and all men under pain of damnation are to believe it? Or if you cannot, (as I am certain you cannot) go then, and Vaunt your Church, for the only Watchful, Faithful, Infallible Keeper of the Apostles Traditions; when here this very Tradition, which here in particular was deposited with the *Thessalonians* and the Premitive Church, you have utterly lost it, so that there is no Footstep or print of it remaining, which with Divine Faith we may rely upon. Blessed therefore be the goodness of God, who seeing that what was not written, was in such danger to be lost, took order, that what was necessary should be written! S. *Chrysostoms* counsel therefore, of *accounting the Churches Traditions worthy of belief*, we are willing to obey: And if you can of any thing make it appear, that *it is Tradition*, we will seek no farther. But this we say withal, that we are persuaded we cannot make this appear in any thing, but *only the Canon of Scripture*, and that there is nothing now extant, and to be known by us, which can put in so good Plea, to be the unwritten Word of God, as the unquestioned Books of Canonical Scripture, to be the written Word of God.

47. You conclude this Paragraph with a sentence of S. *Austin*'s who says, *The Church doth not approve, nor dissemble, nor do these things which are against Faith*

or

or good Life : and from hence you conclude, *that it never hath done ſo, nor never can do ſo.* But though the argument hold in Logick *à non poſſe, ad non eſſe,* yet I never heard, that it would hold back again, *à non eſſe, ad non poſſe.* The Church cannot do this, therefore it does it not, follows with good conſequence: but the Church does not this, therefore it ſhall never do it, nor can never do it, this I believe will hardly follow. In the Epiſtle next before to the ſame *Januarius,* writing of the ſame matter, he hath theſe words, *It remains that the thing you inquire of, muſt be of that third kind of things, which are different in divers places. Let every one therefore do, that which he finds done in the Church to which he comes, for none of them is againſt Faith or good manners.* And why do you not infer from hence, that *no particular Church can bring up any Cuſtom that is againſt Faith or good manners ?* Certainly this conſequence has as good reaſon for it as the former. If a man ſay of the Church of *England,* (what S *Auſtin* of the Church) that ſhe neither approves, nor diſſembles, nor does any thing againſt Faith or good manners, would you collect preſently, that this man did either make or think the Church of *England* infallible? Furthermore, it is obſervable out of this, and the former Epiſtle, that this Church *which did not* (as S. *Auſtin* according to you, thought) *approve or diſſemble, or do any thing againſt Faith or good Life,* did yet tolerate and diſſemble vain ſuperſtitions, and humane preſumptions, and ſuffer all places to be full of them, and to be exacted, as, nay more ſeverely than the commandments of God himſelf. This S. *Auſtin* himſelf profeſſeth in this very Epiſtle. *This* (ſaith he) *I do infinitely grieve at, that many moſt wholeſom precepts of the Divine Scripture, are little regarded; and in the mean time, all is ſo full of ſo many preſumptions, that he is more grievouſly found fault with, who during his octaves, toucheth the Earth with his naked Foot, than he that ſhall bury his Soul in Drunkenneſs.* Of theſe he ſays, *that they were neither contained in Scripture, decreed by Councils, nor corroborated by the Cuſtom of the Univerſal Church.* And *though not againſt Faith, yet unprofitable burdens of Chriſtian Liberty, which*

made the condition of the Jews *more tolerable than that of Christians.* And therefore he professes of them, *Approbare non possum, I cannot approve them.* And *ubi facultas tribuitur, resecanda existimo, I think they are to be cut off, whereſoever we have power.* Yet ſo deeply were they rooted, and ſpread ſo far, through the indiſcreet devotion of the People, always more prone to ſuperſtion than true Piety, and through the connivence of the Governors, who ſhould have ſtrangled them at their Birth, that himſelf, though he grieved at them, and could not allow them, yet for fear of offence he durſt not ſpeak againſt them, *multa hujuſmodi propter nonnullarum vel ſanctarum vel turbulentarum perſonarum ſcandala devitanda liberius improbare non audeo. Many of theſe things for fear of ſcandalizing many holy perſons, or provoking thoſe that are turbulent, I dare not freely diſallow.* Nay, the Catholick Church it ſelf, did ſee and diſſemble, and tolerate them; for theſe are the things of which he preſently ſays after, *the Church of God* (and you will have him ſpeak of the true Catholick Church) *placed between Chaffe and Tares, tolerates many things.* Which was directly againſt the command of the Holy Spirit, given the Church by S. *Paul*; *To ſtand faſt in that liberty wherewith Chriſt hath made her free, and not to ſuffer her ſelf to be brought in bondage to theſe ſurvile burdens.* Our Saviour tells the Scribes and Phariſees, *that in vain they Worſhiped God, teaching for Doctrines mens Commandments: For that laying aſide the Commandments of God, they held the Traditions of men, as the waſhing of Pots, and Cups, and many other ſuch like things.* Certainly that which S. *Auſtin* complains of, as the general fault of Chriſtians of his time, was parallel to this: *Multa* (ſaith he) *quæ in divinis libris ſaluberrima præcepta ſunt, minus curantur*; This I ſuppoſe I may very well render in our Saviours Words, *The commandments of God are laid aſide*; and then; *tam multis preſumptionibus ſic plena ſunt omnia, all things, or all places, are ſo full of ſo many preſumptions, and thoſe exacted with ſuch ſeverity, nay with Tyranny, that he was more ſeverely cenſured, who in the time of his Octaves touched the Earth with his naked Feet, than he which drown-*

ed

ed and buried his Soul in Drink. Certainly, if this be not *to teach for Doctrines mens Commandments*, I know not what is. And therefore these superstitious Christians might be said, *to Worship God in vain*, as well as Scribes and Pharisees. And yet great variety of superstitions of this kind, were then already spread over the Church, being different in divers place. This is plain from these Words of S. *Austin* of them, *diversorum locorum diversis moribus innumerabiliter variantur*; and apparent, because the stream of them was grown so violent, that he durst not oppose it, *liberiùs improbare non audeo, I dare not freely speak against them.* So that to say, the Catholick Church tolerated all this, and for fear of offence, durst not abrogate or condemn it, is to say (if we Judge rightly of it) that the Church with silence and connivence generally tolerated Christians to *worship God in vain.* Now how this tolerating of Universal superstition in the Church, can consist with the assistance and direction of Gods omnipotent spirit to guard it from superstition, and with the accomplishment of that pretended Prophesie of the Church, I *have set Watchmen upon thy Walls, O* Jerusalem, *which shall never hold their peace Day nor Night*; besides how these superstitions being thus nourished, cherished, and strengthned by the practice of the most, and urged with great violence upon others as the commandments of God, and but fearfully opposed or contradicted by any, might in time take such deep Root, and spread their Branches so far, as to pass for Universal Customs of the Church, he that does not see, sees nothing. Especially, considering the catching and contagious nature of this sin, and how fast ill Weeds spread, and how true and experimented that rule is of the Historian, *Exempla non consistunt ubi incipiunt, sed quamlibet in tenuem recepta tramitem latissimè evagandi sibi faciunt potestatem.* Examples do not stay where they begin, but tho at first pent up in a narrow Tract, they make themselves room for extravagant wandrings. Nay that some such superstition had not already even in S. *Austins* time, prevailed so far, as to be *Consuetudine universæ Ecclesiæ roboratum*, confirmed by the Custom

Custom of the Universal Church, who can doubt that considers, that the practice of *Communicating Infants*, had even then got the credit, and authority, not only of an Universal Custom, but also of an Apostolick Tradition.

49. But now after all this ado, what if S. *Austin* says not this which is pretended of the Church, *viz. That she neither approves, nor dissembles, nor practises any thing against Faith or good Life,* but only of good men in the Church? Certainly, though some Copies read as you would have it, yet you should not have dissembled, that others read the place otherwise, *vix. Ecclesia multa tolerat, & tamen, quæ sunt contra Fidem & bonam vitam, nec bonus approbat,* &c. *The Church tolerates many things; and yet what is against Faith or good Life, a good man will neither approve, nor dissemble, nor practise.*

50. Ad §. 17. *That* Abraham *begat Isaacc,* is a point very far from being Fundamental; and yet I hope you will grant, that *Protestants* believing Scripture to be the Word of God, may be certain enough of the truth and certainty of it. For what if they say *that the Catholick Church, and much more themselves may possibly Err in some unfundamental points,* it is therefore consequent, they can be certain of none such? What if a wiser man than I may mistake the sense of some obscure place of *Aristotle,* may I not therefore without any arrogance or inconsequence, conceive my self certain that I understand him in some plain places, which carry their sense before them? And then for points Fundamental, to what purpose do you say, *That we must first know what they be, before we can be assured that we cannot Err in understanding the Scripture*; when we pretend not at all to any assurance that we cannot Err, but only to a sufficient certainty, that we do not Err, but rightly understand those things that are plain, whether Fundamental or not Fundamental? That *God is, and is a rewarder of them that seek him:* That *there is no Salvation but by Faith in Christ:* That by *repentance and Faith in Christ Remission of sins may be obtained:* That *there shall be a Resurrection of the Body:* These we conceive both true,

true, becauſe the Scripture ſavs ſo, and Truths Fundamental, becauſe they are neceſſary parts of the Goſpel, whereof our Saviour ſaies, *Qui non crediderit, damnabitur.* All which we either learn from Scripture immediately, or learn of thoſe that learn it of Scripture, ſo that neither Learned nor Unlearned pretend to know theſe things independently of Scripture. And therefore in imputing this to us, you cannot excuſe your ſelf from having done us a palpable injury.

52. Ad §. 19.] To that which is here urged of the differences amongſt *Proteſtants* concerning many points: I anſwer, that thoſe differences between *Proteſtants* concerning Errors damnable and not damnable, Truths Fundamental and not Fundamental, may be eaſily reconciled. For either the Error they ſpeak of *may be purely and ſimply involuntary*, or it may be in reſpect of the *cauſe of it voluntary*. If the cauſe of it be ſome voluntary and avoidable fault, the Error is it ſelf ſinful, and conſequently in its own nature damnable; As if by negligence in ſeeking the Truth, by unwillingneſs to find it, by Pride, by obſtinacy, by deſiring that Religion ſhould be true which ſutes beſt with my ends, by fear of mens ill opinion, or any other worldly fear, or any other worldly hope, I betray my ſelf to any Error contrary to any Divine revealed Truth, that Error may be juſtly ſtiled a ſin, and conſequently of it ſelf to ſuch a one damnable. But if I be guilty of none of theſe faults, but be deſirous to know the Truth, and diligent in ſeeking it, and adviſe not at all with Fleſh and Blood about the choice of my opions, but only with God, and that Reaſon that he hath given me, if I be thus qualified, and yet through human infirmity fall into Error, that Error cannot be damnable. Again, the party erring may be conceived either to die with contrition for all his ſins known and unknown, or without it; If he die without it, this Error in it ſelf damnable, will be likewiſe ſo unto him: If he die with contrition (as his Error can be no impediment but he may) his Error though in it ſelf damnable, to him according to your Doctrine, will not prove ſo. And therefore ſome of

of those Authors whom you quote, speaking of Errors whereunto men were betrayed, or wherein they were kept by their Fault, or Vice, or Passion (as for the most part men are:) Others speaking of them, as Errors simply and purely involuntary, and the effects of human infirmity; some as they were *retracted by Contrition* (to use your own phrase) others, as they were not; no marvel though they have past upon them, some a heavier, and some a milder, some an absolving, and some a condemning sentence. The least of all these Errors, which here you mention, having malice enough too frequently mixed with it, to sink a man deep enough into Hell: and the greatest of them all, being according to your Principles, either no fault at all, or very Venial, where there is no malice of the will conjoyned with it. And if it be, yet as the most malignant poyson, will not poyson him that receives with it a more powerful Antidote: so I am confident your own Doctrine will force you to confess, that whosoever dies with Faith in Christ, and Contrition for all sins known and unknown (in which heap all his sinful Errors must be comprized,) can no more be hurt by any the most malignant and pestilent Error, than S. *Paul* by the Viper which he shook off into the fire. Now touching the *necessity of Repentance from Dead works, and Faith in Christ Jesus the Son of God, and Saviour of the World*, they all agree; and therefore you cannot deny, but they agree about all that is simply necessary. Moreover, though, if they should go about to choose out of Scripture all these Propositions and Doctrines which integrate and make up the Body of Christian Religion, peradventure there would not be so exact agreement amongst them, as some say there was between the 70. Interpreters, in Translating the *Old Testament*; yet thus far without Controversie they do all agree, that in the Bible all these things are contained, and therefore, that whosoever does truly and sincerely believe the Scripture, must of necessity either in *Hypothesi*, or at least *in thesi*, either *formally*, or at least *virtually*, either *explicitely*, or at least *implicitely*, either in *Act* or at least in *preparation of mind*, believe all

all things Fundamental: It being not Fundamental, nor required of Almighty God, to believe the true ſenſe of Scripture in all places, but only that we ſhould endeavour to do ſo, and be prepared in mind to do ſo, whenſoever it ſhall be ſufficiently propounded to us. Suppoſe a man in ſome diſeaſe were preſcribed a Medicine conſiſting of twenty ingredients, and he adviſing with Phyſitians, ſhould find them differing in Opinion about it, ſome of them telling him, that all the ingredients were abſolutely neceſſary; ſome, that only ſome of them were neceſſary, the reſt only profitable, and requiſite *ad melius eſſe*, laſtly ſome, that ſome only were neceſſary, ſome profitable, and the reſt ſuperfluous, yet not hurtful; Yet all with one accord agreeing in this, That the *whole receipt had in it all things neceſſary* for the recovery of his health, and that if he made uſe of it, he ſhould infallibly find it ſucceſsful: what wiſe man would not think they agreed ſufficiently for his direction to the recovery of his health? Juſt ſo, theſe *Proteſtant* Doctors, with whoſe diſcords you make ſuch Tragedies, agreeing in *Theſi* thus far, that the *Scripture evidently contains all things neceſſary to Salvation*, both for matter of Faith and of practice, and that whoſoever believes it, and endeavours to find the true ſenſe of it, and to conform his Life unto it, ſhall certainly perform all things neceſſary to Salvation, and undoubtedly be ſaved; agreeing I ſay thus far, what matters it for the direction of men to Salvation, though they differ in opinion, touching what points are abſolutely neceſſary, and what not? What Errors abſolutely repugnant to Salvation, and what not? Eſpecially conſidering that although they differ about the Queſtion of the neceſſity of theſe Truths, yet for the moſt part they agree in this that Truths they are, and profitable at leaſt, though not ſimply neceſſary. And though they differ in the Queſtion, whether the contrary Errors be deſtructive of Salvation, or no, yet in this they conſent, that Errors they are, and hurtful to Religion, though not deſtructive of Salvation. Now that which God requires of us is this; That we ſhould believe the Doctrines of the Goſpel to be Truths,

not all, necessary Truths, for all are not so, and consequently, the repugnant Errors to be falshoods; yet not all such falshoods, as unavoidably draw with them damnation upon all that hold them, for all do not so.

53. Yea but *you say, it is very requisite we should agree upon a particular Catalogue of Fundamental points, for without such a Catalogue, no man can be assured whether or no, he hath Faith sufficient to Salvation.* This I utterly deny as a thing evidently false, and I wonder you should content your self magisterially to say so, without offering any proof of it. I might much more justly, think it enough barely to deny it, without refutation, but I will not. Thus therefore I argue against it. Without being able to make a Catalogue of Fundamentals, I may be assured of the Truth of this Assertion, if it be true, That *the Scripture contains all necessary points of Faith,* and know that I believe explicitely all that is expresst in Scripture, and implicitely all that is contained in them: Now he that believes all this, must of necessity believe all things necessary; Therefore without being able to make a Catalogue of Fundamentals, I may be assured that I believe all things necessary, and consequently that my Faith is sufficient. I said, of the truth of this Assertion, *if it be true:* Because I will not here enter into the Question of the truth of it, it being sufficient for my present purpose, that it may be true, and may be believed without any dependence upon a Catalogue of Fundamentals. And therefore if this be all your reason, to demand a particular Catalogue of Fundamentals, we cannot but think your demand unreasonable. Especially having your self expressed the cause of the difficulty of it, and that is, *Because Scripture doth deliver Divine Truths, but seldom qualifies them, or declares whether they be or be not absolutely necessary to Salvation.* Yet not so seldom, but that out of it I could give you an abstract of the Essential parts of Christianity, if it were necessary, but I have shewed it not so, by confuting your reason, pretended for the necessity of it, and at this time I have no leisure to do you courtesies that are so troublesom to my self. Yet thus much I will promise, that when

when you deliver *a particular Catalogue of your Church Propoſals* with one hand, you ſhall receive a particular Catalogue of what I conceive Fundamental, with the other. For as yet, I ſee no ſuch fair proceeding as you talk of, nor any performance on your own part of that which ſo clamorouſly you require on ours. For as for the Catalogue which here you have given us, in ſaying. *You are obliged under pain of damnation to believe whatſoever the Catholick viſible Church of Chriſt propoſeth as revealed by Almighty God*, it is like a covey of one *Patridg*, or a flock of one ſheep, or a Fleet compoſed of one Ship, or an Army of one man. The Author of *Charity Miſtaken, demands a particular Cataloge of Fundamental points*; And *We* (ſay you) *again and again demand ſuch a Catalogue.* And ſurely, if this one Propoſition, which here you think to ſtop our mouths with, be a Catalogue, yet at leaſt ſuch a Catalogue it is not, and therefore as yet you have not performed what you require. For if to ſet down ſuch a Propoſition, wherein are comprized all points taught by us to be neceſſary to Salvation, will ſerve you inſtead of a Catalogue, you ſhall have Catalogues enough. As, we are obliged to believe all under pain of damnation which God commands us to believe. There's one Catalogue. We are obliged under pain of damnation, to believe all, whereof we may be ſufficiently aſſured, that Chriſt taught it his Apoſtles, his Apoſtles the Church. There's another. We are obliged under pain of damnation to believe Gods Word, and all contained in it to be true. There's a third. If theſe generalities will not ſatisfie you, but you will be importuning us to tell you in particular, what they are which Chriſt taught his Apoſtles, and his Apoſtles the Church, what points are contained in Gods Word; Then I beſeech you do us reaſon, and give us a particular and *exact Inventory of all your Church Propoſals, without leaving out, or adding any*, ſuch a one which all the Doctors of your Church will ſubſcribe to, and if you receive not then a Catalogue of Fundamentals, I for my part will give you leave to proclaim us Banckrupts.

54. Besides this deceitful generality of your Catalogue (as you call it,) another main fault we find with it, that it is extreamly ambiguous; and therefore to draw you out of the Clouds, give me leave to propose some Questions to you concerning it. I would know therefore, whether by believing, you mean explicitely or implicitely? If you mean implicitely, I would know whether your Churches infallibility be under pain of damnation to be believed explicitely, or no? Whether any one point or points besides this, be under the same penalty, to be believed explicitely, or no? And if any, what they be? I would know what you esteem the Propolals of the Catholick Visible Church? In particular, whether the Decree of a *Pope ex Cathedra*, that is, with an intent to oblige all Christians by it, be a sufficient and an obliging propolal? Whether men without danger of damnation may examine such a Decree, and if they think they have just cause, refuse to obey it? Whether the Decree of a Council, without the *Popes* confirmation, be such an obliging Propolal, or no? Whether it be so in case there be no *Pope*, or in case it be doubtful who is *Pope*? Whether the Decree of a general Council confirmed by the *Pope*, be such a Propolal, and whether he be an *Heretick* that thinks otherwise? Whether the Decree of a particular Council confirmed by the *Pope*, be such a Propolal? Whether the General uncondemned practice of the Church for some Ages be such a sufficient Propolition? Whether the consent of the most eminent Fathers of any Age, agreeing in the affirmation of any Doctrine, not contradicted by any of their Contemporaries, be a sufficient Propolition? Whether the Fathers testifying such or such a Doctrine or Practice to be Tradition, or to be the Doctrine or Practice of the Church, be a sufficient assurance that it is so? Whether we be bound under pain of damnation, to believe every Text of the Vulgar Bible, now Authorized by the *Roman Church*, to be the true Translation of the Originals of the Prophets, and Evangelists, and Apostles, without any the least alteration? Whether they that lived when the Bible

Bible of *Sixtus* was set forth, were bound under pain of damnation to believe the same of that? And if not of that, of what Bible they were bound to believe it? Whether the Catholick Visible Church be alwaies that Society of Christians which adheres to the Bishop of *Rome*? Whether every Christian, that hath ability and opportunity, be not bound to endeavour to know Explicitely the Propolals of the Church? Whether Implicite Faith in the Churches Veracity, will not save him that Actually and Explicitely disbelieves some Doctrine of the Church, not knowing it to be so; and Actually believes some damnable *Heresie*, as that God has the shape of a man? Whether an ignorant man be bound to believe any point to be decreed by the Church, when his Priest or Ghostly Father assures him it is so? Whether his Ghostly Father may not Err in telling him so, and whether any man can be obliged under pain of damnation, to believe an Error? Whether he be bound to believe such a thing defined, when a number of Priests, perhaps Ten or Twenty tell him it is so? And what assurance he can have, that they neither Err, nor deceive him in this matter? Why Implicite Faith in Christ, or the Scriptures should not suffice for a mans Salvation, as well as implicite Faith in the Church? Whether when you say, *Whatsoever the Church proposeth*, you mean all that ever she proposed, or that only which she now proposeth; and whether she now proposeth all that ever she did propose? Whether all the Books of Canonical Scripture were sufficiently declared to the Church to be so, and proposed as such by the Apostles? And if not, from whom the Church had this declaration afterwards? If so, whether all men ever since the Apostles time, were bound under pain of damnation to believe the Epistle of S. *James*, and the Epistle to the *Hebrews* to be Canonical; at least, not to disbelieve it, and believe the contrary? Lastly, why it is not sufficient for any mans Salvation to use the best means he can to inform his Conscience, and to follow the direction of it? To all these demands when you have given fair and ingenious answers, you shall hear further from me.

55. Ad

55. Ad §. 20.] At the first entrance into this Parag. from our own Doctrine, *That the Church cannot Err in Points necessary, it is concluded if we are wise, we must forsake it in nothing, least we should forsake it in something necessary.* To which I answer, First, that the supposition as you understand it, is falsly imposed upon us, and as we understand it will do you no service. For when we say, that there shall be *a Church alwaies*, somewhere or other, *unerring in Fundamentals*, our meaning is but this, that *there shall be alwaies a Church*, to the very being whereof it is repugnant that it should Err in Fundamentals; for if it should do so, it would want the very essence of a Church, and therefore cease to be a Church. But we never annexed this privileg *to any one Church of any one Denomination*, as the *Greek* or the *Roman* Church: which if we had done, and set up some setled certain Society of Christians, distinguishable from all others by adhering to such a Bishop for our Guide in Fundamentals, then indeed, and then only might you with some colour, though with no certainty, have concluded that we could not in Wisdom, *forsake this Church in any point, for fear of forsaking it in a necessary point.* But now that we say not this of any one determinate Church, which alone can perform the Office of Guide or Director, but indefinitely of the Church, meaning no more but this, *That there shall be alwaies in some place or other, some Church that Errs not in Fundamentals*; will you conclude from hence, that we cannot in Wisdom forsake this or that, the *Roman* or the *Greek* Church, for fear of Erring in Fundamentals?

56. Yea, but you may say (for I will make the best I can of all your Arguments,) *That this Church thus unerring in Fundamentals, when* Luther *arose, was by our confession the* Roman; *and therefore we ought not in Wisdom to have departed from it in any thing.* I answer: First, that we confess no such thing, that the Church of *Rome* was then this Church, but only a Part of it, and that the most corrupted and most incorrigible. Secondly, that if by adhering to the Church, we could have been thus far secured, this Argument had some shew of reason. But seeing

ſeeing we are not warranted thus much by any priviledg of that Church, that ſhe cannot Err Fundamentally, but only from Scripture, which aſſures us that ſhe doth Err very heinouſly, collect our hope, that the Truths ſhe retains and the practice of them, may prove an Antidote to her, againſt the Errors which ſhe maintains in ſuch Perſons, as in ſimplicity of Heart follow this *Abſalom*; we ſhould then do againſt the light of our Conſcience, and ſo ſin damnably if we ſhould not abandon the profeſſion of her Errors though not Fundamental. Neither can we thus conclude, we may ſafely hold with the Church of *Rome* in all her points, for ſhe cannot Err damnably; For this is falſe, ſhe may, though perhaps ſhe does not: But rather thus, Theſe points of Chriſtianity, which have in them the nature of Antidotes againſt the Poyſon of all Sins and Errors, the Church of *Rome*, though otherwiſe much corrupted, ſtill retains; therefore we hope ſhe Errs not Fundamentally, but ſtill remains a Part of the Church. But this can be no warrant to us to think with her in all things: ſeeing the very ſame Scripture, which puts us in hope ſhe Errs not Fundamentally, aſſures us that in many things, and thoſe of great moment ſhe Errs very grevioufly. And theſe Errors though to them that believe them, we hope they will not be pernitious, yet the profeſſing of them againſt Conſcience, could not but bring us to certain damnation. *As for the fear of departing from ſome Fundamental Truths withal, while we depart from her Errors,* Happily it might work upon us, if adhering to her might ſecure us from it, and if nothing elſe could: But both theſe are falſe. For firſt, adhering to her in all things cannot ſecure us from erring in Fundamentals: Becauſe though *de facto* we hope ſhe does not Err, yet we know no priviledges ſhe has, but ſhe may Err in them her ſelf: and therefore we had need have better ſecurity hereof than her bare Authority. Then ſecondly, without dependence on her at all, we may be ſecured that we do not Err Fundamentally; I mean by believing all thoſe things plainly ſet down in Scripture, wherein all things neceſſary, and moſt

most things profitable are plainly delivered. Suppose I were Travelling to *London*, and knew two ways thither, the one very safe and convenient, the other very inconvenient, and dangerous, but yet a way to *London*: and that I overtook a Passenger on the way, who himself believed, and would fain perswade me, there was no other way but the worse, and would perswade me to accompany him in it, because I confessed his way, though very inconvenient, yet a way; so that going that way we could not fail of our Journies end, by the consent of both Parties: but he believed, my way to be none at all; and therefore I might justly fear, lest out of a desire of leaving the worst way, I left the true, and the only way: If now I should not be more secure upon my own knowledge, than frighted by this fallacity, would you not beg me for a Fool? Just so might you think of us, if we would be frighted out of our own knowledge by this bugbear. For the only and the main reason why we believe you not to Err in Fundamentals, is your holding the *Doctrines of Faith in Christ and Repentance:* which knowing we hold as well as you, notwithstanding our departure from you, we must needs know that we not Err in Fundamentals, as well as we know that you do not Err in some Fundamentals, and therefore cannot possibly fear the contrary. Yet let us be more liberal to you, and grant that which can never be proved, that God had said in plain terms, *The Church of* Rome *shall never destroy the Foundation,* but withal had said, *that it might and would lay much Hay and Stubble upon it*; That you should never hold any Error destructive of Salvation, but yet many that were prejudicial to Edification: I demand, might we have dispensed with our selves in the believing and professing these Errors in regard of the smalness of them? Or had it not been a damnable sin to do so, though the Errors in themselves were not damnable? Had we not had as plain Direction to depart from you in some things profitable, as to adhere to you in things necessary? In the beginning of your Book, when it was for your purpose to have it so, the greatness or smalness of the

the matter was not conſiderable, the Evidence of the Revelation was all in all. But here we muſt err with you in ſmall things, for fear of looſing your direction in greater: and for fear of departing too far from you, not go from you at all, even where we ſee plainly that you have departed from the Truth.

57. Beyond all this, I ſay, that this which you ſay *in wiſdom we are to do*, is not only unlawful, but, if we will proceed according to reaſon, impoſſible. I mean to adhere to you in all things, having no other ground for it, but becauſe you are (as we will now ſuppoſe) Infallible in ſome things, that is, in Fundamentals. For, whether by skill in Architecture a large ſtructure may be ſupported by a narrow foundation, I know not; but ſure I am, in reaſon, no concluſion can be larger than the Principles on which it is founded. And therefore if I conſider what I do, and be perſwaded, that your infallibility, is but limited, and particular, and partial, my adherence upon this ground, cannot poſſibly be Abſolute and Univerſal and Total. I am confident, that ſhould I meet with ſuch a man amongſt you (as I am well aſſur'd there be many) that would grant your Church Infallible only in Fundamentals, which what they are he knows not, and therefore upon this only reaſon adheres to you in all things: I ſay that I am confident, that it may be demonſtrated, that ſuch a man adheres to you, with a fiducial and certain aſſent in nothing. To make this clear (becauſe at the firſt hearing it may ſeem ſtrange) give me leave, good Sir, to ſuppoſe you the man, and to propoſe to you a few queſtions, and to give for you ſuch anſwers to them, as upon this ground you muſt of neceſſity give, were you preſent with me. Firſt, ſuppoſing you hold your Church Infallible in Fundamentals, obnoxious to Error in other things, and that you know not what points are Fundamental, I demand, *C.* Why do you believe the Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation? *K.* becauſe the Church hath taught it, which is Infallible. *C.* What? Infallible in all things, or only in Fundamentals? *K.* in Fundamentals only. *C.* Then in other points ſhe may err? *K.* ſhe may. *C.* and do you know

what Points are Fundamental, what not? *K.* No, and therefore I believe her in all things, least I should disbelieve her in fundamentals. *C.* How know you then, whether this be a fundamental point or no? *K.* I know not. *C.* It may be then (for ought you know) an unfundamental point? *K.* yes, it may be so. *C.* And in these you said the Church may err? *K.* yes I did so. *C.* Then possibly it may err in this? *K.* It may do so. *C.* Then what certainty have you, that it does not err in it? *K.* None at all, but upon this supposition, that this is a Fundamental. *C.* And this supposition you are uncertain of? *K.* Yes, I told you so before. *C.* And therefore, you can have no certainty of that, which depends upon this uncertainty, saving only a suppositive certainty, if it be a Fundamental truth, which is in plain English to say, you are certain it is true, if it be both true and necessary. Verily Sir, if you have no better Faith than this, you are no Catholick. *K.* good words I pray! I am so, and God willing will be so. *C.* You mean, in outward profession and practice, but in belief you are not, no more than a *Protestant* is a *Catholick.* For every *Protestant* yields such a kind of assent to all the proposals of the Church, for surely they believe them true, if they be Fundamental Truths. And therefore you must either believe the Church Infallible in all her proposals, be they foundations, or be they superstructions, or else you must believe all Fundamental which she proposes, or else you are no *Catholick.* *K.* But I have been taught, that *seeing I believed the Church Infallible in points necessary, in wisdom I was to believe her in every thing.* *C.* That was a pretty plausible inducement, to bring you hither, but now you are here, you must go farther, and believe her Infallible in all things, or else you were as good go back again, which will be a great disparagement to you, and draw upon you both the bitter and implacable hatred of our part, and even with your own, the imputation of rashness and levity. You see, I hope, by this time, that though a man did believe your Church Infallible in Fundamentals; yet he has no reason to do you the courtesie, of believing all her proposals; nay if he be ignorant what

these

theſe Fundamentals are, he has no certain ground to believe her, upon her Authority in any thing. And whereas you ſay, it can be no imprudence to err with the Church; I ſay, it may be very great imprudence, if the queſtion be, Whether we ſhould err with the preſent Church, or hold true with God Almighty.

60. Whereas you add, That *that viſible Church which cannot err in Fundamental, propounds all her definitions without diſtinction to be believed under* Anathema's: *Anſ.* Again you beg the queſtion, ſuppoſing untruly, that there is, any *that Viſible Church*, I mean any Viſible Church of one Denomination, which cannot err in points Fundamental. Secondly, propoſing definitions to be believed under Anathema's, is no good argument, that the Propounders conceive themſelves infallible; but only, that they conceive the Doctrine they condemn is evidently damnable. A plain proof hereof is this, that particular Councils, nay particular men, have been very liberal of their Anathema's, which yet were never conceived infallible, either by others or themſelves. If any man ſhould now deny Chriſt to be the Saviour of the world, or deny the Reſurrection, I ſhould make no great ſcruple of Anathematizing his Doctrine, and yet am very far from dreaming of Infallibility.

62. The effect of the next Argument is this, *I cannot without grievous ſin diſobey the Church, unleſs I know ſhe commands thoſe things which are not in her power to command: and how far this power extends, none can better inform me than the Church. Therefore I am to obey, ſo far as the Church requires my obedience.* I Anſwer, Firſt, That neither hath the *Catholick Church*, but only a corrupt part of it declared her ſelf, nor required our obedience, in the points conteſted among us. This therefore is falſely, and vainly ſuppoſed here by you, being one of the greateſt queſtions amongſt us. Then Secondly, That God can better inform us, what are the limits of the Churches power, than the Church her ſelf, that is, than the *Roman* Clergy, who being men ſubject to the ſame paſſions with other men, why they ſhould be thought the beſt Judges in their own

cause, I do not well understand! But yet we oppose against them, no human decisive Judges, not any Sect or Person, but only God and his Word. And therefore it is in vain to say, That *in following her, you shall be sooner excused, than in following any Sect or Man applying Scriptures against her Doctrine:* In as much as we never went about to arrogate to our selves that Infallibility or absolute Authority, which we take away from you. But if you would have spoken to the purpose, you should have said, that in following her you should sooner have been excused, than in cleaving to the Scripture, and to God himself.

63. Whereas you say, *The fearful examples of innumerable persons, who forsaking the Church, upon pretence of her errors, have failed even in fundamental points, ought to deter all Christians from opposing her in any one doctrine or practice*; This is, just as if you should say, divers men have fallen into *Scylla*, with going too far from *Charybdis*, be sure therefore ye keep close to *Charybdis:* divers leaving prodigality, have fallen into covetousness, therefore be you constant to prodigality; many have fallen from worshipping God perversely and foolishly, not to worship him at all, from worshipping many Gods, to worship none; this therefore ought to deter men, from leaving Superstition or Idolatry, for fear of falling into Atheism and Impiety. This is your counsel and Sophistry: but God says clean contrary; *Take heed you swerve not, either to the right hand or to the left: you must not do evil that good may come thereon*; therefore neither that you may avoid a greater evil, you must not be obstinate in a certain error, for fear of an uncertain. What if some, forsaking the Church of *Rome*, have forsaken Fundamental Truths? Was this because they forsook the Church of *Rome?* No sure, this is *non causa pro causa:* for else all that have forsaken that Church should have done so, which we say they have not. But because they went too far from her, the golden mean, the narrow way is hard to be found, and hard to be kept; hard, but not impossible: hard, but yet you must not please your self out of it, though you err on the right hand, though you offend on the milder part, for this is the

the only way that leads to life, and few there be that find it. It is true, if we ſaid, there were no danger in being of the *Roman* Church, and there were danger in leaving it, it were madneſs to perſwade any man to leave it. But we proteſt and proclaim the contrary, and that we have very little hope of their Salvation, who either out of negligence in ſeeking the truth, or unwillingneſs to find it, live and die in the errors and impieties of that Church: and therefore cannot but conceive thoſe fears to be moſt fooliſh and ridiculous, which perſwade men to be conſtant in one way to hell, leſt happily if they leave it, they ſhould fall into another.

64. Obj. *Some Proteſtants, pretending to reform the Church, are come to affirm that ſhe periſhed for many Ages, which others cannot deny to be a Fundamental Error againſt the Article of the Creed, I believe the Catholick Church, and affirm the* Donatiſts *erred Fundamentally in confining it to* Africa.

To this I Anſwer, Firſt, that the error of the *Donatiſts* was not, that they held it poſſible that ſome, or many, or moſt parts of *Chriſtendom*, might fall away from Chriſtianity, and that the Church may looſe much of her amplitude, and be contracted to a narrow compaſs in compariſon of her former extent; which is proved not only poſſible but certain, by irrefragable experience. For who knows not, that *Gentiliſm*, and *Mahumetiſm*, mans wickedneſs deſerving it, and Gods providence permitting it, have prevailed to the utter extirpation of Chriſtianity, upon far the greater part of the world? And S. *Auſtin* when he was out of the heat of Diſputation, confeſſes the Militant Church to be *like the Moon*, ſometimes increaſing, and ſometimes decreaſing. This therefore was no error in the *Donatiſts*, that they held it poſſible, that the Church, from a larger extent, might be contradicted to a leſſer: or that they held it poſſible to be reduced to *Africa*; (For why not to *Africk* then, as well as within theſe few ages, you pretend it was to *Europe?*) But their error was, that they held *de facto*, this was done when they had no juſt ground or reaſon to do ſo; and ſo upon a vain pretence which they could not juſtify, ſeparated themſelves from the communion of all

all other parts of the Church: and that they required it as a necessary condition to make a man a member of the Church, that he should be of their Communion, and divide himself from all other Communions from which they were divided: which was a condition both unnecessary and unlawful to be required, and therefore the exacting of it was directly opposite to the Churches Catholicism; in the very same nature with their Errors who required Circumcision, and the keeping of the Law of *Moses* as necessary to salvation. For whosoever requires harder or heavier conditions of men, than God requires of them, he it is that is properly an Enemy of the Churches Universality, by hindring either Men or Countries from adjoyning themselves to it; which, were it not for these unnecessary and therefore unlawful conditions, in probability would have made them members of it. And seeing the present Church of *Rome* perswades men they were as good (for any hope of Salvation they have) not to be Christians as not to be *Roman* Catholicks, believe nothing at all, as not to believe all which they impose upon them: Be absolutely out of the Churches Communion, as be out of their Communion, or be in any other, whether they be not guilty of the same crime, with the *Donatists* and those Zelots of the Mosaical Law, I leave it to the judgment of those that understand reason! This is sufficient to shew the vanity of this Argument. But I add moreover, that you neither have named those *Protestants* who held the Church to have perished for many ages; who perhaps held not the destruction but the corruption of the Church; not that the true Church, but that the pure Church perished: or rather that the Church perished not from its life and existence, but from its purity and integrity, or perhaps from its splendor and visibility. Neither have you proved by any one reason, but only affirmed it, to be a fundamental Error, to hold that the Church Militant may possibly be driven out of the world, and abolished for a time from the face of the earth.

69. Ad §. 23. In all these Texts of Scripture, which are here alledged in this last Section of this Chapter, or in any one of them, or in any other, doth God say clearly and plainly,

plainly, *The Bishop of* Rome *and that Society of Christians which adheres to him shall be ever the infallible guide of Faith?* You will confess, I presume, he doth not, and will pretend, it was not necessary. Yet if the King should tell us the Lord-Keeper should judge such and such causes, but should either not tell us at all, or tell us but doubtfully who should be Lord-Keeper, should we be any thing the nearer for him to an end of contentions? Nay rather would not the dissentions about the Person who it is, increase contentions, rather than end them? Just so it would have been, if God had appointed a Church to be Judge of Controversies, and had not told us which was that Church. Seeing therefore God does nothing in vain, and seeing it had been in vain, to appoint a Judge of Controversies, and not to tell us plainly who it is, and seeing lastly, he hath not told us plainly, no not at all who it is, is it not evident he hath appointed none? *Obj.* But (you will say perhaps) *if it be granted once, that some Church of one denomination, is the Infallible guide of Faith, it will be no difficult thing to prove, that yours is the Church, seeing no other Church pretends to be so.* Ans. Yes, the Primitive and the Apostolick Church pretends to be so. That assures us, that the *spirit was promised, and given to them, to lead them into all saving truth,* that they might lead others. Obj. *But that Church is not now in the world, and how then can it pretend to be the guide of Faith? Ans.* It is now in the world sufficiently, to be our guide: not by the persons of those men that were members of it, but by their Writings which do plainly teach us, what truth they were led into, and so lead us into the same truth. Obj. *But these Writings, were the Writings of some particular men, and not of the Church of those times: how then doth that Church guide us by these Writings? Now these places shew that a Church is to be our guide, therefore they cannot be so avoided. Ans.* If you regard the conception and production of these Writings, they were the Writings of particular men: But if you regard the reception, and approbation of them, they may be well called the Writings of the Church, as having the attestation of the Church, to have been written by those that were inspired, and directed

directed by God. As a Statute, though penned by some one man, yet being ratified by the Parliament, is called the Act, not of that man, but of the Parliament. Obj. But the *words seem clearly enough to prove, that the Church, the present Church of every Age, is Universally infallible.* *Ans.* For my part, I know I am as willing and desirous, that the Bishop or Church of *Rome* should be Infallible, (provided I might know it) as they are to be so esteemed. But he that would not be deceived must take heed, that he take not his desire that a thing should be so, for a reason that it is so. For if you look upon Scripture, through such Spectacles as these, they will appear to you, of what colour pleases your fancies best: and will seem to say, not what they do say, but what you would have them. As some say the *Manna*, wherewith the *Israelites* were fed in the Wilderness, had in every mans mouth, that very taste which was most agreeable to his palate. For my part I profess, I have considered them a thousand times, and have looked upon them (as they say,) on both sides, and yet to me they seem to say no such matter.

70. Not the First, *Mat.* 16:18.) For the *Church may err, and yet the gates of Hell not prevail against her.* It may err, and yet continue still a true Church, and bring forth Children unto God, and send Souls to Heaven. And therefore this can do you no service, without the plain begging of the point in Question. *Viz.* That every Error is one of the gates of Hell. Which we absolutely deny, and therefore, you are not to suppose, but to prove it. Neither is our denial without reason. For seeing you do, and must grant, that a particular Church may hold some error, and yet be still a true member of the Church: why may not the Universal Church, hold the same error, and yet remain the true Universal?

71. Not the Second or Third. (*John* 14. 16, 17. *John* 16. 13.) For *the Spirit of Truth, may be with a Man, or a Church for ever, and teach him all Truth:* And yet he may fall into some error, if this, *all,* be not *simply all,* but all of some kind.

Secondly,

Secondly, he may fall into ſome Error, even contrary to the truth which is taught him, if it be taught him *only ſufficiently, and not irreſiſtibly,* ſo that he may learn it if he will, not ſo that he muſt and ſhall, whether he will or no. Now who can aſſertain me, that the Spirits teaching is not of this nature? Or how can you poſſibly reconcile it, with your Doctrine of free-will in believing, if it be not of this nature? Beſides, the word in the Original is ὁδηγήσει, which ſignifies, to be a guide and director only, not to compel or neceſſitate. Who knows not, that a guide may ſet you in the right way, and you may either negligently miſtake, or willingly leave it? And to what purpoſe doth God conplain ſo often, and ſo earneſtly of ſome, that *had eyes to ſee and would not ſee, that ſtopped their Ears, and cloſed their Eyes, leſt they ſhould hear and ſee?* Of others *that would not underſtand, leſt they ſhould do good: that the Light ſhined, and the Darkneſs comprehended it not:* That *he came unto his own, and his own received him not: That light came into the World, and Men loved Darkneſs more than Light: To what purpoſe ſhould he wonder, ſo few believed his report, and that to ſo few his Arm was revealed: And that when he comes, he ſhould find no Faith upon Earth; If his outward teaching were not of this nature,* that it might be followed, and might be reſiſted? And if it be, then God may teach, and the Church not learn: God may lead, and the Church be refractory and not follow. And indeed, who can doubt, that hath not his Eyes vailed with prejudice, that God hath taught the Church of *Rome* plain enough in the Epiſtle to the *Corinthians,* that *all things in the Church are to be done for edification,* and that, in any publick Prayers, or Thanks-givings, or Hymns, or Leſſons of inſtruction, to *uſe a Language,* which the aſſiſtants *generally underſtand not,* is not for edification? Though the Church of *Rome* will not learn this, for fear of confeſſing an Error, and ſo overthrowing her Authority, yet the time will come, when it ſhall appear, that not only by ſcripture, they were taught this ſufficiently, and commanded to believe, but by reaſon and

common sense. And so for the Communion, in both kinds, who can deny but they are taught it by our Saviour *John* 6. in these Words, according to most of your own expositions, *Unless you Eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and Drink his Blood, you have no Life in you.* (If our Saviour speak there of the Sacrament, as to them he does, because they conceive he does so.) Though they may pretend, that receiving in one kind, they receive the Blood together with the Body, yet they can with no Face pretend that they drink it: And so obey not our Saviours injunction according to the letter, which yet they *profess is literally, always to be obeyed, unless some impiety, or some absurdity force us to the contrary*: and they are not yet arrived to that impudence to pretend, that either there is impiety or absurdity in receiving the Communion in both kinds. This therefore they if not others, are plainly taught by our Saviour in this place. But by S. *Paul* all without exception, when he says, *Let a man examine himself, and so let him Eat of this Bread and Drink of this Chalice.* This (*a Man*) that is to examine himself, is *every man*, that can do it: as is confessed on all hands. And therefore it is all one, as if he had said, *let every man examine himself, and so let him Eat of this Bread, and Drink of this Cup.* They which acknowledg Saint *Pauls* Epistes, and Saint *Johns* Gospel to be the Word of God, one would think should not deny, but that they are taught these two Doctrines plain enough. Yet we see they neither do, nor will learn them. I conclude therefore, that the Spirit may very well teach the Church, and yet the Church fall into and continue in Error, by not regarding what she is taught by the Spirit.

72. But all this I have spoken upon a supposition only, and shewed unto you, that though these promises, had been made unto the present Church of every Age (I might have said though they had been to the Church of *Rome* by name,) yet no certainty of her Universal Infallibility could be built upon them. But the plain truth is, that these Promises are vainly arrogated by you, and were never made to you, but to the Apostles

ſtles only. I pray deal ingenuouſly and tell me, who were they of whom our Saviour ſays, *Theſe things have I ſpoken unto you, being preſent with you.* c. 14. 25. *But the comforter, ſhall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatſoever I have told you* v. 26? Who are they to whom he ſays, *I go away and come again unto you; and I have told you before it come to paſs:* v. 28. 29. *You have been with me from the beginning:* c. 15. v. 27? And again, *theſe things I have told you, that when the time ſhall come, you may remember that I told you of them: and theſe things I ſaid not to you at the beginning, becauſe I was with you,* c. 16. 4. *And becauſe I ſaid theſe things unto you, ſorrow hath filled your Hearts,* v. 6? Laſtly, who are they of whom he ſaith, v. 12. *I have yet many things to ſay unto you, but ye cannot bear them now?* Do not all theſe circumſtances appropriate this whole diſcourſe of our Saviour to his Diſciples, that were then with him, and conſequently, reſtrain the Promiſes of the Spirit of truth, which was *to lead them into all truth,* to their Perſons only? And ſeeing it is ſo, is it not an impertinent arrogance and preſumption, for you to lay claim unto them, in the behalf of your Church? Had Chriſt been preſent with your Church? Did the Comforter bring theſe things to the Remembrance of your Church, which Chriſt had before taught and ſhe had forgotten? Was Chriſt then departing from your Church? And did he tell of his departure before it came to paſs? Was your Church with him from the beginning? Was your Church filled with ſorrow, upon the mentioning of Chriſts departure? Or laſtly, did he, or could he have ſaid to your Church, which then was not extant, *I have yet many things to ſay unto you, but ye cannot bear them now?* as he ſpeaks in the 13. *verſ.* immediately before the words by you quoted. And then goes on, *Howbeit when the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all Truth.* Is it not the ſame *You* he ſpeaks to, in the 13. *verſ.* and that he ſpeaks to in the 14? And is it not apparent to any one that has but half an Eye, that in the 13. he ſpeaks only to them that then were with him? Beſides in the very Text by you

alledged, there are things promised, which your Church cannot with any modesty pretend to. For there it is said, *the Spirit of Truth*, not only *will guide you into all Truth*, but also *will shew you things to come.* Now your Church (for ought I could ever understand) does not so much as pretend to the Spirit of Prophesie, and knowledge of future events: And therefore hath as little cause to pretend to the former promise, of being *led by the Spirit into all truth.* And this is the Reason, why both You in this place, and generally, your writers of Controversies, when they entreat of this Argument, cite this Text perpetually by halfs, there being in the latter part of it, a clear, and convincing Demonstration, that you have nothing to do with the former. Unless you will say, which which is most ridiculous, that when our Saviour said, *He will teach you*, &c. and *he will shew you*, &c. He meant one *You* in the former clause, and another *You* in the latter.

73. *Obj.* But this *is to confine Gods Spirit to the Apostles only, or to the Disciples, that then were present with him: which is directly contrary to many places of Scripture.* Ans. I confess, that to confine the Spirit of God to those that were then present with Christ is against Scripture. But I hope it is easie to conceive a difference, between confining the *Spirit of God* to them: and confining *the Promises made in this place* to them. God may do many things which he does not Promise at all: much more, which he does not promise in such or such a place.

74. *Obj.* But *it is promised in the* 14. *Chap. that this Spirit shall abide with them for ever: Now they in their persons were not to abide for ever; and therefore the Spirit could not abide with them, in their Persons for ever, seeing the coexistence of two things, supposes of necessity, the existence of either. Therefore the promise was not made to them only in their Persons, but by them to the Church, which was to abide for ever.* Ans. Your Conclusion is, *not to them only*, but your Reason concludes, either nothing at all, or that this Promise of abiding with them for ever, was not made to their Persons at all; or if it were, that it was not performed. Or if you will not say (as I hope you will not) that it was

not

not performed, nor that it was not made to their Persons at all; then must you grant, that the Word *for ever*, is here used in a sense restrained, and accommodated to the subject here entreated of; and that it signifies, *not Eternally*, without end of time, *but perpetually* without interruption, for the time of their lives. So that the force, and sense of the Words is, that they should never want the Spirits assistance, in the performance of their function: And that the Spirit would not (as Chirst was to do,) stay with them for a time, and afterwards leave them, but would abide with them, if they kept their station, unto the very end of their lives, which is mans *for ever*. Neither is this use of the word, *for ever*, any thing strange, either in our ordinary speech, wherein we use to say, this is mine for ever, this shall be yours for ever, without ever dreaming of the Eternity, either of the thing or Persons. And then in Scripture, it not only will bear, but requires this sense very frequently, as *Exod.* 21. 6. *Deut.* 15. 17. *his Master shall bore his Ear through with an Awl, and he shall serve him for ever.* Psal. 52. 9. *I will praise thee for ever.* Psal. 61. 4. *I will abide in thy Tabernacle for ever.* Psal. 119. 111. *Thy Testimonies have I taken as mine Heritage for ever:* and lastly in the Epistle to *Philemon, He therefore departed from thee for a time, that thou shouldest receive him for ever.*

75. And thus, I presume, I have shewed sufficiently, that this *for ever*, hinders not, but that the promise may be appropriated to the Apostles, as by many other circumstances I have evinced it must be. But what now, if the place produced by you, as a main pillar of your Churches Infallibility, prove upon Tryal, an Engine to batter and overthrow it, at least, (which is all one to my purpose) to take away all possibility of our assurance of it? This will seem strange news to you at first hearing, and not far from a prodigy. And I confess, as you here in this place, and generally all your Writers of Controversie, by whom this Text is urged, order the matter, it is very much disabled, to do any service against you in this question. For with a bold sacriledg, and horrible impiety,

piety, somewhat like *Procrustes* his cruelty, you perpetually cut off the Head and Foot, the beginning and end of it; and presenting to your confidents, who usually read no more of the Bible, than is alledged by you, only these words, *I will ask my Father, and he shall give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever, even the Spirit of Truth*, conceal in the mean time, the words before, and the words after; that so, the promise of Gods Spirit, may seem to be absolute, whereas it is indeed most clearly aud expressly conditional: being both in the words before, restrained to those only, that *love God and keep his commandments*: and in the words after, flatly denied to all, whom the Scriptures stile by the name of *the World*, that is, as the very *Antithesis* give us plainly to understand, *to all wicked and worldly men.* Behold the place entire, as it is set down in your own Bible. *If ye love me keep my Commandments, and I will ask my Father, and he shall give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever, even the spirit of the Truth, whom the World cannot receive.* Now from the place there restored and vindicated from your mutilation, thus I argue against your pretence. We can have no certainty of the Infallibility of your Church, but upon this supposition, that your *Popes* are infallible in confirming the Decrees of General Councils: we can have no certainty hereof, but upon this supposition, that the Spirit of truth is promised to him, for his direction in this work. And of this again we can have no certainty, but upon supposal, that he performs the condition, whereunto the promise of the Spirit of truth is expressly limited, *viz. That he love God and keep his Commandments*; and of this finally, not knowing the *Popes* Heart, we can have no certainty at all; therefore from the first to the last, we can have no certainty at all of your Churches Infallibility. This is my first Argument: From this place another follows, which will charge you as home as the former. If many of the *Roman* See, were such men as could not receive the Spirit of Truth, even men of the World, that is Worldly, Wicked, Carnal, Diabolical men, then the

the Spirit of Truth, is not here promiſed, but flatly denied them: and conſequently we can have no certainty, neither of the Decrees of Councils, which theſe *Popes* confirm, nor of the Churches Infallibility, which is guided by theſe Decrees: But many of the *Roman* See, even by the confeſſion of the moſt zealous Defenders of it, were ſuch men: therefore the Spirit of truth is not here promiſed but denyed them, and conſequently we can have no certainty, neither of the Decrees which they confirm, nor of the Churches Infallibility, which guides her ſelf by theſe Decrees.

76. You may take as much time as you think fit, to anſwer theſe Arguments. In the mean while I proceed to the conſideration of the next Text alledged for this purpoſe by you: out of S. *Paul* 1. Epiſtle to *Timothy*: cap. 3. 15. where he ſaith, as you ſay *the Church is the Pillar and ground of truth,* But the truth is you are ſomewhat to bold with S. *Paul.* For he ſays not in formal terms, what you make him ſay, *the Church is the Pillar and Ground of Truth,* neither is it certain that he means ſo: for it is neither impeſſible nor improbable, thatthe words *the Pillar and Ground of truth,* may have reference not to the Church, but to *Timothy,* the ſenſe of the place *that thou maieſt know how to behave thy ſelf, as a Pillar and ground of truth, in the Church of God, which is the houſe of the living God,* which expoſition offers no violence at all to the words, but only ſuppoſes an Ellipſis of the Particle ὡς, in the Greek very ordinary. Neither wants it ſome likelihood, that S. *Paul* comparing the Church to a Houſe, ſhould here exhort *Timothy,* to carry himſelf, as a Pillar in that Houſe ſhould do, according as he had given other Principal men in the Church, the name of Pillars; rather than, having called the Church a *Houſe,* to call it preſently a *Pillar*; which may ſeem ſomewhat heterogeneous. Yet if you will needs have S. *Paul* refer this not to *Timothy* but the Church, I will not contend about it any farther, than to ſay, poſſibly it may be otherwiſe. But then ſecondly, I am to put you in mind, that the Church which S. *Paul* here ſpeaks of, was that in which *Timothy* converſe-d

versed, and that was a Particular Church, and not the *Roman*; and such you will not have to be Universally Infallible.

77. Thirdly, if we grant you out of Courtesie (for nothing can enforce us to it) that he both speaks of the Universal Church, and says this of it, then I am to remember you, that many Attributes in Scripture are not Notes of Performance but of Duty, and teach us not what the thing or Person is of necessity, but what it should be. *Ye are the Salt of the Earth*, said our Saviour to his Disciples: not that this quality was inseparable from their Persons, but because it was their Office to be so. For if they must have been so of necessity, and could not have been otherwise, in vain had he put them in fear of that which follows, *If the Salt hath lost his savour, wherewith shall it be Salted? it is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast forth, and to be trodden under Foot.* So the Church may be by Duty, the Pillar and Ground, that is, the Teacher of Truth, of all truth, not only necessary but profitable to Salvation; and yet she may neglect and violate this Duty, and be in fact, the teacher of some Error.

78. Fourthly and lastly, if we deal most liberally with you, and grant that the Apostle here speaks of the Catholick Church, calls it the *Pillar and ground of Truth*, and that not only because it should, but because it always shall and will be so, yet after all this, you have done nothing; your Bridge is too short, to bring you to the Bank where you would be, unless you can shew that by truth here, is certainly meant, not only *all necessary* to Salvation, but all that is profitable, absolutely and *simply All*. For that the true Church alwaies shall be the maintainer and teacher of all necessary truth, you know we grant and must grant, for it is of the essence of the Church to be so, and any company of Men were no more a Church without it, than any thing can be a Man, and not be reasonable. But as a Man may be still a Man, though he want a Hand or an Eye, which yet are profitable parts, so the Church may be still a Church

Church, though it be defective in ſome profitable truth. And as a Man may be a Man, that has ſome Boyls and Botches on his Body, ſo the Church may be the Church, though it have many corruptions both in Doctrine and practice.

79. And thus you ſee we are at liberty from the former places; having ſhewed that the ſenſe of them, either muſt or may be ſuch as will do your Cauſe no ſervice. But the laſt you ſuppoſe, will be a *Gordian* knot, and ties us faſt enough: The words are, *Eph.* 4. 11, 12, 13. *He gave ſome Apoſtles, and ſome Prophets,* &c. *to the conſummation of Saints, to the work of the Miniſtry,* &c. *Until we all meet into the Unity of Faith,* &c. *That we be not hereafter Children, wavering and carried up and down with every wind of Doctrine.* Out of which words, this is the only argument which you collect, or I can collect for you. There is no means to conſerve unity of Faith, againſt every wind of Doctrine, unleſs it be a Church univerſally Infallible. But it is impious to ſay there is no means to conſerve unity of Faith againſt every wind of Doctrine: Therefore there muſt be a Church univerſally Infallible. Whereunto I anſwer, that your major is ſo far from being confirmed, that it is plainly confuted, by the place alledged. For that tells us of another means for this purpoſe, to wit, the *Apoſtles, and Prophets, and Evangeliſts, and Paſtors, and Doctors,* which Chriſt gave upon his Aſcenſion, and that their *conſummating the Saints, doing the work of the Miniſtry,* and *Edifying the body of Chriſt,* was the means to bring thoſe (which are there ſpoken of, be they who they will,) to *the unity of Faith, and to perfection in Chriſt,* that they might not be *wavering, and carried about, with every wind of falſe Doctrine.* Now the Apoſtles, and Prophets, and Evangeliſts, and Paſtors, and Doctors, are not the preſent Church; therefore the Church is not the only means for this end, nor that which is here ſpoken of.

80. Peradventure by, *he gave,* you conceive, is to be underſtood, *he promiſed that he would give unto the worlds end.* But what reaſon have you for this conceit? Can you ſhew that the word, ἔδωκε, hath this ſignification in other

places, and that it must have it in this place? Or will not this interpretation drive you presently to this blasphemous absurdity, that God hath not performed his promise? Unless you will say, which for shame I think you will not, that you have now, and in all Ages since Christ have had Apostles, and Prophets, and Evangelists: for as for Pastors, and Doctors alone, they will not serve the turn. For if God promised to give all these, then you must say he hath given all, or else that he hath broke his promise. Neither may you pretend, that the *Pastors and Doctors were the same with the Apostles, and Prophets, and Evangelists, and therefore having Pastors and Doctors, you have all.* For it is apparent, that by these names, are denoted several Orders of men, clearly distinguished and diversified by the Original Text; but much more plainly by your own Translations, for so you read it, *some Apostles, and some Prophets, and other some Evangelists, and other some Pastors and Doctors:* and yet more plainly in the parallel place, 1 *Cor.* 12. to which we are referred by your Vulgar Translation, *God hath set some in the Church, first Apostles, secondarily Prophets, thirdly Teachers,* therefore this subterfuge is stopped against you. Obj. But *how can they, which died in the first Age, keep us in Unity, and guard us from Error, that live now, perhaps in the last? This seems to be all one, as if a Man should say, that* Alexander, *or* Julius Cæsar *should quiet a mutiny in the King of* Spains *Army. Ans.* I hope you will grant, that *Hippocrates,* and *Galen,* and *Euclid,* and *Aristotle,* and *Salust,* and Cæsar, and *Livie,* were dead many Ages since; and yet that we are now preserved from Error by them, in a great part of Physick, of Geometry, of Logick, of the *Roman* story. But what if these men had writ by divine Inspiration, and writ compleat bodies of the Sciences they professed, and writ them plainly and perspicuously? You would then have granted, I believe, that their works had been sufficient to keep us from error, and from dissention in these matters. And why then should it be incongruous to say, that the Apostles, and Prophets, and Evangelists, and Pastors, and Doctors, which Christ gave upon his Ascension, by their writings, which

which some of them writ but all approved, are even now sufficient means, to conserve us in Unity of Faith, and guard us from Error? Especially seeing these writings are, by the confession of all parts, true and divine, and as we pretend and are ready to prove, contain a plain and perfect Rule of Faith; and as the * Chiefest of you acknowledge, *contain immediatly, all the Principal and Fundamental points of Christianity,* referring us to the Church and Tradition only for some minute particularities. But tell me I pray, the Bishops that composed the Decrees of the Council of *Trent,* and the Pope that confirmed them, are they means to conserve you in Unity, and keep you from Error, or are they not? Peradventure you will say, *their Decrees are, but not their Persons:* but you will not deny I hope, that you owe your unity, and freedom from Error, to the Persons that made these Decrees: neither will you deny, that the writings which they have left behind them, are sufficient for this purpose. And why may not then the Apostles writings be as fit for such a purpose, as the Decrees of your Doctors? Surely their intent in writing was to conserve us in unity of Faith, and to keep us from Error, and we are sure God spake in them; but your Doctors from whence they are, we are not so certain. Was the Holy Ghost then unwilling, or unable to direct them so, that their writings should be fit and sufficient to attain that end they aimed at in writing? For if he were both able and willing to do so, then certainly he did do so. And then their writings may be very sufficient means, if we would use them as we should do, to preserve us in unity, in all necessary points of Faith, and to guard us from all pernitious Error.

* *Perron.*

81. If yet you be not satisfied, but will still pretend that, *all these words by you cited, seem clearly enough to prove, that the Church is Universally infallible, without which Unity of Faith could not be conserved against every wind of Doctrin:* I *Ans.* That to you, which will not understand, that there can be any means to conserve the unity of Faith, but only that which conserves your authority over the Faithful, it is no marvel that these words seem to prove, that the

Church, nay that your Church is universally Infallible. But we that have no such end, no such desires, but are willing to leave all men to their liberty, provided they will not improve it to a Tyranny over others, we find it no difficulty to discern between *dedit* and *promisit, he gave at his Ascension,* and *he promised to the Worlds end.* Besides, though you whom it concerns, may happily flatter your selves, that you have not only Pastors, and Doctors, but Prophets, and Apostles, and Evangelists, and those distinct from the former still in your Church; yet we that are disinteressed persons, cannot but smile at these strange imaginations. Lastly, though you are apt to think your selves such necessary instruments for all good purposes, and that nothing can be well done unless you do it; that no unity or constancy in Religion can be maintained, but inevitably Christendom must fall to ruin, and confusion, unless you support it: yet we that are indifferent and impartial, and well content, that God should give us his own favours, by means of his own appointment, not of our choosing, can easily collect out of these very words, that not the Infallibility of your, or of any Church, but the *Apostles, and Prophets, and Evangelists,* &c. *which Christ gave upon his Ascension,* were designed by him, for the compassing all these excellent purposes, by their preaching while they lived, and by their writings for ever. And if they fail hereof, the Reason is not any insufficiency or invalidity in the means, but the voluntary perverseness of the Subjects they have to deal with: who, if they would be themselves, and be content that others should be, in the choice of their Religion the servants of God and not of men; if they would allow, that the way to Heaven is no narrower now, than Christ left it, his yoak no heavier than he made it; that the belief of no more difficulties, is required now to Salvation, than was in the Primitive Church; that no Error is in it self destructive, and exclusive from Salvation now, which was not then; if instead of being zealous *Papists,* earnest *Calvinists*, rigid *Lutherans*, they would become themselves, and be content that others should be plain and honest Christians;

if

if all men would believe the Scripture, and freeing themſelves from prejudice and paſſion, would ſincerely endeavour to find the true ſenſe of it, and live according to it, and require no more of others, but to do ſo; nor denying their Communion to any that do ſo, would ſo order their publick ſervice of God, that all which do ſo may without ſcruple, or hypocriſie, or proteſtation againſt any part of it, joyn with them in it: who does not ſee that (ſeeing as we ſuppoſe here, and ſhall prove hereafter,) all neceſſary Truths, are plainly and evidently ſet down in Scripture, there would of neceſſity be among all men, in all things neceſſary, unity of Opinion? And notwithſtanding any other differences that are or could be, unity of Communion and Charity and mutual Toleration? By which means, all Schiſm and Hereſie, would be baniſhed the World, and thoſe wretched contentions which now rend and tear in pieces, not the Coat, but the Members and Bowels of Chriſt, which mutual pride and Tyranny, and curſing, and killing, and damning, would fain make immortal, ſhould ſpeedily receive a moſt bleſſed Cataſtrophe. But of this hereafter, when we ſhall come to the queſtion of Schiſm, wherein I perſwade my ſelf, that I ſhall plainly ſhew, that the moſt vehement accuſers, are the greateſt offenders, and that they are indeed at this time, the greateſt Schiſmaticks, who make the way to Heaven narrower, the yoak of Chriſt heavier, the differences of Faith greater, the conditions of Eccleſiaſtical Communion harder, and ſtricter, than they were made at the beginning by Chriſt and his Apoſtles: they who talk of Unity, but aim at Tyranny, and will have peace with none, but with Slaves and Vaſſals. In the mean while, though I have ſhewed how Unity of Faith, and Unity of Charity too, may be preſerved without your Churches Infallibility, yet ſeeing you modeſtly conclude from hence, not that your Church is, but only *ſeems to be* univerſally Infallible, meaning to your ſelf, of which you are a better judge than I: Therefore I willingly grant your concluſion, and proceed.

86. As

86. As for your pretence, That *to find the meaning of those places, you confer divers Texts, you consult Originals, you examin Translations, and use all the means by Protestants appointed,* I have told you before, that all this is vain and hypocritical, if (as your manner and your doctrin is) you give not your self liberty of judgment in the use of these means; if you make not your selves Judges of, but only Advocates for the doctrin of your Church, refusing to see what these means shew you, if it any way make against the doctrin of your Church, though it be as clear as the light at noon. Remove prejudice, even the ballance, and hold it even, make it indifferent to you which way you go to heaven, so you go the true, which Religion be true so you be of it, then use the means and pray for Gods assistance, and as sure as God is true, you shall be lead into all necessary Truth.

88. Whereas you say, that *it were great impiety to imagin that God, the lover of Souls, hath left no certain infallible means to decide both this and all other differences arising about the interpretation of Scripture, or upon any other occasion:* I desire you to take heed, you commit not an impiety in making more impieties than Gods Commandments make. Certainly God is no way obliged either by his promise or his love to give us all things, that we may imagine would be convenient for us, as formerly I have proved at large. It is sufficient that he denies us nothing necessary to Salvation. *Deus non deficit in necessariis, nec redundat in superfluis:* So D. *Stapleton.* But that the ending of all Controversies, or having a certain means of ending them, is necessary to Salvation, that you have often said and supposed, but never proved, though it be the main pillar of your whole discourse. So little care you take how slight your foundations are, so your building make a fair show. And as little care, how you commit those faults your self, which you condem in others. For you here charge them with great impiety, who imagine that *God the lover of Souls hath left no infallible means to determine all differences arising about the interpretation of Scripture, or upon any other occasion:* And yet afterwards being demanded by D. *Potter, why the Questions*

ſtions between the Jeſuits and Dominicans remain undetermined? You return him this croſs interrogatory, *Who hath aſſured you that the point wherein theſe learned men differ, is a revealed Truth, or capable of definition, or is not rather by plain Scripture indeterminable, or by any Rule of Faith?* So then when you ſay, *it were great impiety to imagine that God hath not left infallible means to decide all differences*; I may anſwer, It ſeems you do not believe your ſelf. For in this controverſie, which is of as high conſequence as any can be, you ſeem to be doubtful whether there be any means to determin it. On the other ſide, when you ask D. *Potter, who aſſured him that there is any means to determine this Controverſie?* I anſwer for him, that you have, in calling *it a great impiety to imagine that there is not ſome infallible means to decide this and all other differences ariſing about the Interpretation of Scripture, or upon any other occaſion.* For what trick you can deviſe to ſhew that this difference, between the *Dominicans* and *Jeſuits*, which includes a difference about the ſenſe of many Texts of Scripture, and many other matters of moment, was not included under *this and all other differences*, I cannot imagine. Yet if you can find out any, thus much at leaſt we ſhall gain by it, *that general ſpeeches are not always to be underſtood generally, but ſometimes with exceptions and limitations.*

89. But if there be any infallible means to decide all differences, I beſeech you name them. *You ſay it is to conſult and hear Gods Viſible Church with ſubmiſſive acknowledgment of her Infallibility.* But ſuppoſe the difference be (as here it is) *whether your Church be Infallible*, what ſhall decide that? If you would ſay (as you ſhould do) Scripture and Reaſon, then you foreſee that you ſhould be forced to grant that theſe are fit means to decide this Controverſie, and therefore may be as fit to decide others. Therefore to avoid this, you run into a moſt ridiculous abſurdity, and tell us that this difference alſo, whether the Church be Infallible, as well as others, muſt be agreed by *a ſubmiſſive acknowledgment of the Churches Infallibility.* As if you ſhould have ſaid, My Brethren, I perceive this is a great contention amongſt you, whether the *Roman* Church be

be Infallible? If you will follow my advice, I will shew you a ready means to end it; you must first agree that the *Roman* Church is Infallible, and then your contention whether the *Roman* Church be Infallible, will quickly be at an end. Verily a most excellent advice, and most compendious way of ending all Controversies, even without troubling the Church to determine them! For why may not you say in all other differences, as you have done in this? Agree that the *Pope* is supream head of the Church: That the substance of Bread and Wine in the Sacrament is turned into the body, and blood of Christ: That the Communion is to be given to Lay-men but in one kind: That Pictures may be worshipped: That Saints are to be invocated; and so in the rest, and then your differences about the Popes Supremacy, Transubstantiation, and all the rest will speedily be ended. If you say, the advice is good in this, but not in other cases, I must request you not to expect always, to be believed upon your word, but to shew us some reason, why any one thing, namely the Churches Infallibility, is fit to prove it self; and any other thing, by name the Popes Supremacy, or Transubstantiation is not as fit? Or if for shame you will at length confess, that the Churches Infallibility is not fit to decide this difference, whether the Church be infallible, then you must confess it is not fit to decide all: Unless you will say, it may be fit to decide all, and yet not fit to decide this, or pretend that this is not comprehended under all. Besides if you grant that your Churches infallibility cannot possibly be well grounded upon, or decided by it self, then having professed before, that *there is no possible means besides this, for us to agree hereupon,* I hope you will give me leave to conclude, that it is impossible upon good ground for us to agree that the *Roman* Church is Infallible. For certainly light it self, is not more clear than the evidence of this syllogism: If there be no other means to make men agree upon your Churches Infallibility, but only this, and this be no means, then it is simply impossible for men upon good grounds to agree that your Church is Infallible: But there is (as you have granted) no other possible

ſible means to make men agree hereupon, but only a ſubmiſſive acknowledgment of her Infallibility, And this is apparently no means; Therefore it is ſimply impoſſible for men upon good grounds to agree that your Church is Infallible.

90. Laſtly to the place of S. *Auſtin, wherein we are adviſed to follow the way of Catholick Diſcipline, which from Chriſt himſelf by the Apoſtles hath come down even to us, and from us ſhall deſcend to all poſterity:* I anſwer, That the way which S. *Auſtin* ſpeaks of, and the way which you commend, being divers ways, and in many things clean contrary, we cannot poſſibly follow them both; and therefore for you to apply the ſame words to them is a vain equivocation. Shew us any way, and do not ſay, but prove it *to have come from Chriſt and his Apoſtles down to us*; and we are ready to follow it. Neither do we expect demonſtration hereof, but ſuch reaſons as may make this more probable than the contrary. But if you bring in things into your now Catholick Diſcipline, which Chriſtians in S. *Auſtins* time held abominable, (as the Picturing of God,) and which you muſt confeſs to have come into the Church Seven Hundred Years after Chriſt: if you will bring in things, as you have done the half Communion, with a *non obſtante, notwithſtanding Chriſt Inſtitution, and the practice of the Primitive Church were to the contrary:* If you will do ſuch things as theſe, and yet would have us believe, that your whole Religion came from Chriſt and his Apoſtles, this we conceive a requeſt too unreaſonable for modeſt men to make, or for wiſe Men to grant.

CHAP. IV.

The ANSWER to the Fourth CHAPTER.

Wherein is shewed, that the Creed contains all necessary points of meer Belief.

AD §. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.] Concerning the Creeds containing the Fundamentals of Christiany, this is D. *Potters* assertion, delivered in the 207. p. of his Book. *The Creed of the Apostles (as it is explained in the latter Creeds of the Catholick Church) is esteemed a sufficient summary or Catalogue of Fundamentals, by the best learned Romanists and by Antiquity.*

2. By *Fundamentals* he understands *not the Fundamental rules of good Life and Action,* (though every one of these is to be believed to come from God, and therefore virtually includes an Article of Faith;) but the Fundamental *Doctrines of Faith*; such, as though they have influence upon our lives, as every essential Doctrine of Christianinity hath, yet we are commanded to believe them, and not to do them. The assent of our understandings is required to them, but no obedience from our wills.

3. But these speculative Doctrines again he distinguishes out of *Aquinas, Occham,* and *Canus* and others, into two kinds: of the first are those which are the *Objects of Faith, in, and for themselves,* which by their own nature and Gods prime intention, are essential parts of that Gospel: such as the Teachers in the Church, cannot without Mortal sin omit to teach the Learners: such as are intrinsecal to the Covenant between God and Man; and not only plainly revealed by God, and so *certain* truths, but also commanded to be preacht to all men, and to be believed distinctly by all, and so *necessary truths.* Of the second sort are *Accidental, Circumstantial, Occasional* objects of Faith; Millions whereof there are in Holy Scripture; such as are to be believed, not for themselves, but

but becauſe they are joyned with others, that are neceſſary to be believed, and delivered by the ſame Authority which delivered theſe. Such as we are not bound to know to be Divine Revelations, (for without any fault we may be Ignorant hereof, nay believe the contrary;) ſuch as we are not bound to examine, whether or no they be Divine Revelations: ſuch as Paſtors are not bound to teach their Flock, nor their Flock bound to know and remember: no nor the Paſtors themſelves to know them, or believe them, or not to disbelieve them abſolutely and always; but then only when they do ſee, and know them to be delivered in Scripture, as Divine Revelations.

4. I ſay when they do ſo, and not only when they may do. For to lay an obligation upon us of believing, or not disbelieving any Verity, ſufficient Revelation on Gods part, is not ſufficient: For then ſeeing all the expreſs Verities of Scripture are either to all men, or at leaſt to all learned men ſufficiently revealed by God, it ſhould be a damnable ſin, in any learned men actually to disbelieve any one particular Hiſtorical verity contained in Scripture, or to believe the contradiction of it, though he knew it not to be there contained. For though he did not, yet he might have known it; it being plainly revealed by God, and this revelation being extant in ſuch a Book, wherein he might have found it recorded, if with dilligence he had peruſed it. To make therefore any points neceſſary to be believed, it is requiſite, that either we actually know them to be Divine Revelations: and theſe though they be not Articles of Faith, nor neceſſary to be believed, in and for themſelves, yet indirectly, and by accident, and by conſequence, they are ſo: The neceſſity of believing them, being inforced upon us, by a neceſſity of believing this Eſſential, and Fundamental Article of Faith, *That all Divine Revelations are true,* which to disbelieve, or not to believe, is for any Chriſtian not only impious, but impoſſible. Or elſe it is requiſite that they be, Firſt actually revealed by God. Secondly, commanded under pain of damnation, to be

particularly known (I mean known to be Divine Revelations,) and diſtinctly to be believed. And of this latter ſort of ſpeculative Divine Verities, *D. Potter* affirmed, *that the Apoſtles Creed was a ſufficient ſummary:* yet he affirmed it, not as his own opinion, but as the Doctrine of the *Ancient Fathers, and your own Doctors.* And beſides, he affirmed it not as abſolutely certain, but very probable.

5. In brief, all that he ſays is this: It is *very probable, that according to the judgment of the* Roman *Doctors, and the Ancient Fathers, the Apoſtles Creed is to be eſteemed a ſufficient ſummary of all thoſe Doctrines which being meerly* Credenda, *and not* Agenda, *all men are ordinarily, under pain of Damnation, bound particularly to believe.*

6. Now *this aſſertion* (you ſay) *is neither pertinent to the queſtion in hand, nor in it ſelf true.* Your Reaſons to prove it *impertinent,* put into form and diveſted of impertinencies are theſe. 1. *Becauſe the queſtion was not, what points were neceſſary to be explicitely believed, but what points were neceſſary not to be disbelieeved after ſufficient propoſal. And therefore to give a Catalogue of points, neceſſary to be explicitely believed is impertinent.*

7. *Secondly, becauſe Errors may be damnable, though the contrary truths be not of themſelves Fundamental; as that* Pontius Pilate *was our Saviours Judge, is not in it ſelf a Fundamental truth, yet to believe the contrary were a damnable Error. And therefore to give a Catalogue of Truths in themſelves Fundamental, is no pertinent ſatisfaction to this demand, what Errors are damnable?*

8. *Thirdly, becauſe if the Church be not Univerſally infallible, we cannot ground any certainty upon the Creed, which we muſt receive upon the Credit of the Church: and if the Church be Univerſally Infallible, it is damnable to oppoſe her declaration in any thing, though not contained in the Creed.*

9. *Fourthly, Becauſe not to believe the Articles of the Creed in the true ſenſe is damnable, therefore it is frivolous to ſay the Creed contains all Fundamentals, without ſpecifying in what ſenſe the Articles of it are Fundamental.*

10. *Fifthly, becauſe the Apoſtles Creed (as D.* Potter *himſelf confeſſes) was not a ſufficient Catalogue, till it was explained by*

by the firſt Council; nor then until it was declared in the ſecond, &c. by occaſion of emergent Hereſies: Therefore now alſo as new Hereſies may ariſe, it will need particular explanation, and ſo is not yet, nor ever will be a compleat Catalogue of Fundamentals.

11. Now to the firſt of theſe objections I ſay: Firſt, that your diſtinction between points neceſſary to be believed, and neceſſary not to be disbelieved, is more ſubtil than ſound, a diſtinction without a difference: There being no point neceſſary to be believed, which is not neceſſary not to be disbelieved: Nor no point to any man, at any time, in any circumſtances neceſſary not to be disbelieved, but it is to the ſame man, at the ſame time, in the ſame circumſtances, neceſſary to be believed. Yet that which (I believe) you would have ſaid, I acknowledge true, that many points which are not neceſſary to be believed abſolutely, are yet neceſſary to be believed upon a ſuppoſition, that they are known to be revealed by God: that is, become then neceſſary to be believed, when they are known to be Divine Revelations. But then I muſt needs ſay, you do very ſtrangly, in ſaying, that *the queſtion was, what points might lawfully be disbelieved, after ſufficient Propoſition that they are Divine Revelations.* You affirm, that none may, and ſo does *D. Potter*, and with him all Proteſtants, and all Chriſtians. And how then is this the queſtion? Who ever ſaid or thought, that of Divine Revelations, known to be ſo, ſome might ſafely and lawfully be rejected, and disbelieved, under pretence that they are not Fundamental? which of us ever taught, that it was not damnable, either to deny, or ſo much as doubt of the Truth of any thing, whereof we either know, or believe that God hath revealed it? What Proteſtant ever taught that it was not damnable, either to give God the lie, or to call his Veracity into queſtion? Yet you ſay, *The demand of Charity miſtaken was, and it was moſt reaſonable, that a liſt of Fundamentals, ſhould be given, the denial whereof deſtroys Salvation, whereas the denial of other points may ſtand with Salvation, although both kinds be equally propoſed, as revealed by God.*

12. Let

12. Let the reader peruſe *Charity Miſtaken*, and he ſhall find that this qualification, *although both kinds of points be equally propoſed as revealed by God*, is your addition, atd no part of the demand. And if it had, it had been moſt unreaſonable, ſeeing he and you know well enough, that (though we do not preſently without examination, fall down and worſhip all your Churches propoſals, as Divine Revelations) yet, we make no ſuch diſtinction of known Divine Revelations, as if ſome only of them were neceſſary to be believed, and the reſt might ſafely be rejected. So that to demand a particular minute Catalogue of all points that may not be disbelieved after ſufficient Propoſition, is indeed to demand a Catalogue of all points that are or may be, in as much as none may be disbelieved, after ſufficient Propoſition, that it is a Divine Revelation. At leaſt it is to deſire us, Frſt, to Tranſcribe into this Catalogue, every Text of the whole Bible. Secondly, to ſet down diſtinctly, thoſe innumerous Millions of negative and poſitive conſequences, which may be evidently deduced from it: For theſe we ſay, God hath revealed. And indeed you are not aſhamed in plain terms to require this of us. For having firſt told us, *that the demand was, what points were neceſſary not to be disbelieved, after ſufficient propoſition that they are Divine Truths*: you come to ſay, *Certainly the Creed contains not all theſe.* And this you prove by asking, *how many Truths are there in Holy Scripture, not contained in the Creed, which we are not bound to know and believe, but are bound under pain of damnation not to reject, as ſoon as we come to know that they are found in Holy Scripture?* So that in requiring a particular Catalogue of all points, not to be disbelieved, after ſufficient Propoſal, you require us to ſet you down all points contained in Scripture, or evidently deducible from it. And yet this you are pleaſed to call a *reaſonable*, nay, *a moſt reaſonable Demand*: whereas having ingaged your ſelf to give a Catalogue of your Fundamentals, you conceive your engagement very well ſatisfied by ſaying, *all is Fundamental which the Church propoſes*, without going about, to give us an

an endleſs Inventory of her Propoſals. And therefore from us, inſtead of a perfect particular of Divine Revelations of all ſorts, (of which with a leſs hyperbole than S. *John* uſeth, we might ſay, *If they were to be written, the World would not hold the Books that muſt be written*;) methinks you ſhould accept of this general, All Divine Revelations are true, and to be believed.

13. The very truth is, the main Queſtion in this buſineſs is not, *what Divine Revelations are neceſſary to be believed, or not rejected when they are ſufficiently propoſed*: for all without exception, all without queſtion are ſo; But *what Revelations are ſimply and abſolutely neceſſary to be propoſed to the belief of Chriſtians, ſo that that Society, which does propoſe, and indeed believe them, hath for matter of Faith, the eſſence of a true Church*; *that which does not, has not.* Now to this queſtion, though not to yours, *D. Potter's* aſſertion (if it be true) is apparently very pertinent. And though not a full and total ſatisfaction to it, yet very effectual, and of great moment towards it. For the main queſtion being, what points are neceſſary to Salvation: and points neceſſary to Salvation, being of two ſorts, ſome of *ſimple belief*, ſome of *Practice and Obedience*, he that gives you a ſufficient ſummary, of the firſt ſort of neceſſary points, hath brought you half way towards your Journies end. And therefore that which he does, is no more to be ſlighted, as vain and impertinent, than an Architects work is to be thought impertinent towards the making of a Houſe, becauſe he does it not all himſelf. Sure I am, if his aſſertion be true, as I believe it is, a Corollary may preſently be deduced from it, which if it were imbraced, cannot in all reaſon, but do infinite ſervice, both to the truth of Chriſt, and the peace of Chriſtendom. For ſeeing falſhood and Error could not long ſtand againſt the power of truth, were they not ſupported by Tyranny and worldly advantages, he that could aſſert Chriſtians to that liberty which Chriſt and his Apoſtles left them, muſt need do Truth a moſt Heroical ſervice. And ſeeing the overvaluing of the differences among Chriſtians, is one of the greateſt maintainers of the Schiſm

Schiſm of Chriſtendom, he that could demonſtrate that only theſe points of Belief, are ſimply neceſſary to Salvation, wherein Chriſtians generally agree, ſhould he not lay a very fair and firm Foundation of the peace of Chriſtendom? Now the Corollary which I conceive would produce theſe good effects, and which flowes naturally from D. *Potters* Aſſertion, is this, *That what Man or Church ſoever believes the Creed, and all the evident conſequences of it ſincerely and heartily, cannot poſſibly (if alſo he believe the Scripture) be in any Error of ſimple belief which is offenſive to God; nor therefore deſerve for any ſuch Error to be deprived of his Life, or to be cut off from the Churches Communion, and the hope of Salvation.* And the production of this again would be this (which highly concerns the Church of *Rome* to think of,) *That whatſoever Man or Church does for any Error of ſimple belief, deprive any man ſo quallified as above, either of his temporal life, or livelyhood or liberty, or of the Churches Communion, and hope of Salvation, is for the firſt unjuſt, cruel, and Tyrannous: Schiſmatical, preſumptuous, and uncharitable for the ſecond.*

14. Neither yet is this (as you pretend) to take away the neceſſity of believing thoſe Verities of Scripture, which are not contained in the Creed, when once we come to know that they are written in Scripture, but rather to lay a neceſſity upon men of believing all things written in Scripture, when once they know them to be there written. For he that believes not all known Divine Revelations to be true, how does he believe in God? Unleſs you will ſay, that the ſame man, at the ſame time may not believe God, and yet believe in him. The greater difficulty is, how it will not take away the neceſſity of believing Scripture to be the Word of God? But that it will not neither. For though the Creed be granted a ſufficient ſummary of *Articles of meer Faith*, yet no man pretends that it contains the *Rules of Obedience*, but for them, all men are referred to Scripture. Beſides, he that pretends to believe in God, obligeth himſelf to believe it neceſſary to obey that which reaſon aſſures him to be the Will of God. Now reaſon will aſſure him

him that believes the Creed, that it is the Will of God he ſhould believe the Scripture: even the very ſame Reaſon which moves him to believe the Creed: Univerſal, and never failing Tradition, having given this Teſtimony both to Creed and Scripture, that they both by the works of God were ſealed, and teſtified to be the words of God. And thus much be ſpoken in Anſwer to your firſt Argument; the length whereof will be the more excuſable, If I oblige my ſelf to ſay but little to the reſt.

15. I come then *to your ſecond.* And in Anſwer to it, deny flatly, as a thing deſtructive of it ſelf, that any Error can be damnable, unleſs it be repugnant immediatly or mediatly, directly or indirectly, of it ſelf or by accident, to ſome Truth for the matter of it fundamental. And to your example of *Pontius Pilat*'s *being Judge of Chriſt*, I ſay the denial of it in him that knows it to be revealed by God, is manifeſtly deſtructive of this Fundamental truth, that *all Divine Revelations are true.* Neither will you find any Error ſo much as by accident damnable, but the rejecting of it will be neceſſarily laid upon us, by a real belief of all Fundamentals, and ſimply neceſſary Truths. And I deſire you would reconcile with this, that which you have ſaid §. 15. *Every Fundamental Error muſt have a contrary Fundamental Truth, becauſe of two Contradictory propoſitions in the ſame degree, the one is falſe, the other muſt be true,* &c.

16. *To the Third* I Anſwer; That the certainty I have of the Creed, That it was from the Apoſtles, and contains the principles of Faith, I ground it not upon Scripture, and yet not upon the Infallibility of any preſent, much leſs of your Church, but upon the Authority of the Ancient Church, and written Tradition, which (as D. *Potter* hath proved) gave this conſtant Teſtimony unto it. Beſides I tell you, it is guilty of the ſame fault which D. *Potter*'s Aſſertion is here accuſed of: having perhaps ſome colour toward the proving it falſe, but none at all to ſhew it impertinent.

17. *To the Fourth,* I Anſwer plainly thus, That you find fault with D. *Potter* for his Vertues: you are offended with him for not uſurping the Authority which he hath not; in

a word for not playing the *Pope*. Certainly if *Protestants* be faulty in this matter, it is for doing it too much, and not too little. This presumptuous imposing of the senses of men upon the words of God, the special senses of men upon the general words of God, and laying them upon mens consciences together, under the equal penalty of death, and damnation; this vain conceit that we can speak of the things of God, better than in the word of God: This Deifying our own Interpretations, and Tyrannous inforcing them upon others; This restraining of the word of God from that latitude and generality, and the understandings of men from that liberty, wherein Christ and the Apostles left them, [a] is, and hath been the only fountain of all the Schisms of the Church, and that which makes them immortal: the common incendiary of Christendom, and that which (as I said before) tears into pieces, not the coat, but the bowels, and members of Christ: *Ridente Turcâ nec dolente Judæo.* Take away these Walls of separation, and all will quickly be one. Take away this *Persecuting, Burning, Cursing, Damning* of men for not subscribing to the *words of Men*, as the words of God; Require of Christians only to believe Christ, and to call no man master but him only: Let those leave claiming Infallibility that have no title to it, and let them that in their words disclaim it, disclaim it likewise in their actions; In a word, take away Tyranny, which is the Devils instrument to support errors, and superstitions, and impieties, in the several parts of the World, which could not otherwise long withstand the power of Truth, I say take away Tyranny, and restore Christians to their just and full liberty of captivating their understanding to Scripture only, and as Rivers when they have a free passage, run all to the Ocean, so it may well be hoped by Gods blessing, that Universal Liberty thus moderated, may quickly reduce Christendom to Truth and Unity. These thoughts of peace (I am perswaded) may come from the God of peace, and to his blessing I commend them, and proceed.

[a] This perswasion is no singularity of mine but the Doctrin which I have learnt from Divines of great learning and judgment. Let the Reader be pleased to peruse the seaventh book of *Acontius de Stratag. Satanæ*. And *Zanchius* his last *Oration* delivered by him after the composing of the discord between him and *Amerbachius*, and he shall confess as much.

18. *Your fifth and last objection* stands upon a false and dangerous supposition: That *new Heresies may arise.* For

an

an Hereſie being in it ſelf nothing elſe but a Doctrine Repugnant to ſome Article of the Chriſtian Faith, to ſay that new Hereſies may ariſe, is to ſay, that new Articles of Faith may ariſe: and ſo ſome great ones among you ſtick not to profeſs in plain terms, who yet at the ſame time are not aſhamed to pretend that your whole Doctrin is Catholick and Apoſtolick. So *Salmeron: Non omnibus omnia dedit Deus, ut quælibet ætas ſuis gaudeat veritatibus, quas prior ætas ignoravit.* God hath not given all things to All: So that every age hath its proper Verities, which the former age was ignorant of: *Diſp.* 57. *In Ep. ad Rom.* And again in the Margent: *Habet Unumquodq; ſæculum peculiares Revelationes Divinas,* Every age hath its peculiar Divine Revelations. Where that he ſpeaks of ſuch Revelations as are, or may by the Church be made matters of Faith, no man can doubt that reads him; an example whereof, he gives us a little before in theſe words. *Unius Auguſtini doctrina Aſſumptionis B. Deiparæ cultum in Eccleſiam introduxit.* The Doctrin of *Auguſtin* only, hath brought in to the Church the Worſhip of the Aſſumption of the Mother of God, *&c.* Others again mince and palliate the matter with this pretence, that your Church undertakes not to coyn new Articles of Faith, but only to declare thoſe that want ſufficient declaration. But if ſufficient declaration be neceſſary to make any Doctrin an Article of Faith, then this Doctrin which before wanted it, was not before an Article of Faith; and your Church by giving it the Eſſential form, and laſt complement of an Article of Faith, makes it, though not a Truth, yet certainly an Article of Faith. But I would fain know, whether Chriſt and his Apoſtles knew this Doctrin, which you pretend hath the matter, but wants the form of an Article of Faith, that is, *ſufficient declaration,* whether they knew it to be a neceſſary Article of the Faith, or no! If they knew it not to be ſo: then either they taught what they knew not, which were very ſtrange; or elſe they taught it not: and if not, I would gladly be informed, ſeeing you pretend to no new Revelations from whom you learnt it? If they knew it, then either they concealed or declared

red it. To ſay they concealed any neceſſary part of the Goſpel, is to charge them with far greater Sacriledg, than what was puniſhed in *Ananias* and *Saphira*. It is to charge theſe glorious Stewards, and diſpenſers of the Myſteries of Chriſt, with want of the great vertue requiſite in a Steward, which is *Fidelity*. It is to charge them with preſumption for denouncing Anathema's, even to Angels, in caſe they ſhould teach any other doctrin, than what they had received from them, which ſure could not merit an Anathema, if they left any neceſſary part of the Goſpel untaught. It is in a word, in plain terms to give them the lie, ſeeing they profeſs plainly and frequently, that they taught Chriſtians *the whole Doctrin of Chriſt*. If they did know and declare it, then was it a full and formal Article of Faith; and the contrary a full and formal Hereſie, without any need of further declaration: and then their Succeſſors either continued the declaration of it, or diſcontinued: If they did the latter, how are they ſuch faithful depoſitaries of Apoſtolick Doctrin as you pretend? Or what aſſurance can you give us, that they might not bring in new and falſe Articles, as well as ſuffer the old and true ones to be loſt? If they did continue the declaration of it, and deliver it to their Succeſſors, and they to theirs, and ſo on perpetually, then continued it ſtill a full and formal Article of faith, and the repugnant doctrin a full and formal Hereſie, without and before the definition or declaration of a Council. So that Councils, as they cannot make that a truth or falſhood, which before was not ſo: ſo neither can they make or declare that to be an Article of Faith, or an Hereſie, which before was not ſo. The ſuppoſition therefore on which this argument ſtands, being falſe and ruinous, whatſoever is built upon it, muſt together with it fall to the ground. This explication therefore, and reſtriction of this doctrin, (whereof you make your advantage) was to my underſtanding unneceſſary. The Fathers of the Church in after times might have juſt cauſe to declare their judgment, touching the ſenſe of ſome general Articles of the Creed: but to oblige others to receive their declarations under pain of damnation, what warrant they had I know

know not. He that can ſhew, either that the Church of all Ages was to have this Authority; or that it continued in the Church for ſome Ages, and then expired: He that can ſhew either of theſe things let him: for my part I cannot. Yet I willingly confeſs the judgment of a Council, though not infallible, is yet ſo far directive and obliging that without apparent reaſon to the contrary, it may be ſin to reject it, at leaſt not to afford it an outward ſubmiſſion for publick peace ſake.

20. Ad §. 7. 8, 9. I come now to ſhew that you alſo have requited D. *Potter* with a mutual courteous acknowledgment of his aſſertion, That the Creed is a ſufficient ſummary of all the neceſſary Articles of Faith, which are meerly *Credenda.*

21. Firſt then, §. 8. You have theſe words, *That it cannot be denied that the Creed is moſt full and compleat to that purpoſe, for which the holy Apoſtles, inſpired by God, meant that it ſhould ſerve, and in that manner as they did intend it, which was, not to comprehend all particular points of Faith, but ſuch general heads as were moſt befitting and requiſite for preaching the Faith of Chriſt, to Jews and Gentiles, and might be briefly, and compendiouſly ſet down, and eaſily learnt and remembred.* Theſe words I ſay, being fairly examined, without putting them on the rack, will amount, to a full acknowledgment of D. *Potters* Aſſertion. But before I put them to the queſtion, I muſt crave thus much right of you, to grant me this moſt reaſonable poſtulate, that the doctrin of *repentance from dead works,* which S. *Paul* ſaith, was one of the two only things which he preacht, and the doctrin *of Charity, without which* (the ſame S. *Paul* aſſures us that) *the knowledge of all myſteries, and all faith is nothing,* were doctrins more neceſſary and requiſite, and therefore more fit to be preacht to *Jews* and *Gentiles,* than theſe, *under what judge our Saviour ſuffered,* that *he was buried,* and *what time he roſe again:* which you have taught us cap. 3. §. 2. *for their matter and nature in themſelves not to be Fundamental.*

22. And upon this grant, I will ask no leave to conclude, that, whereas you ſay, *the Apoſtles Creed was intended for a comprehenſion, of ſuch heads of faith, as were moſt befitting and*

and requiſite, for preaching the faith of Chriſt, &c. You are now, for fear of too much debaſing thoſe high doctrines as Repentance and Charity, to reſtrain your aſſertion, as D. *Potter* does his, (and though you ſpeak indefinitely) to ſay you meant it, only of thoſe heads of faith, which are *meerly Credenda*. And then the meaning of it, (if it have any,) muſt be this, That the Creed is full for the Apoſtles intent, which was to comprehend all ſuch general heads of faith, which being points of *ſimple belief*, were moſt fit and requiſite, to be preached to Jews and Gentiles, and might be briefly and compendiouſly ſet down, and eaſily learned and remembred. Neither I nor you, I believe, can make any other ſence of your words than this. And upon this ground thus I ſubſume. But all the points of belief, which were neceſſary, under pain of damnation, for the Apoſtles to preach, and for thoſe to whom the Goſpel was preached, particularly to know and believe, were moſt fit and requiſite, nay more than ſo, neceſſary to be preached to all both Jews and Gentiles, and might be briefly and compendiouſly ſet down, and eaſie learn'd and remembred: therefore the Apoſtles intent by your confeſſion, was in this Creed, to comprehend all ſuch points. And you ſay, *the Creed is moſt full and complete, for the purpoſe which they intended.* The Major of this Syllogiſm is your own. The Minor I ſhould think needs no proof, yet becauſe all men may not be of my mind, I will prove it by its parts; and the firſt part thus, There is the ſame neceſſity, for the doing of theſe things, which are commanded to be done, by the ſame Authority, under the ſame penalty: But the ſame Authority, *viz.* Divine, under the ſame penalty, to wit, of damnation, commanded the Apoſtles, to preach all theſe Doctrines which we ſpeak of, and thoſe to whom they were preached, particularly to know and believe them: For we ſpeak of thoſe only, which were ſo commanded, to be preached and believed: Therefore all theſe points were alike neceſſary to be preached to all both Jews and Gentiles. Now that all theſe doctrines we ſpeak of, may be briefly and compendiouſly ſet down, and eaſily learned and remembred, he that remembers, that we ſpake only

only of ſuch Doctrines as are neceſſary to be taught and learned, will require hereof no farther demonſtration. For, (not to put you in mind of what the Poet ſays, *Non ſunt longa quibus nihil eſt quod demere poſſis,*) who ſees not, that ſeeing the greateſt part of men are of very mean capacities, that it is neceſſary that that may be learnt eaſily, which is to be learn'd of all? What then can hinder me from concluding thus, all the Articles of ſimple belief, which are fit and requiſite to be preached, and may eaſily be remembred, are by your confeſſion comprized in the Creed: but all the neceſſary Articles of Faith are requiſite to be preached, and eaſie to be remembred; therefore they are all comprized in the Creed? Secondly, from grounds granted by you, I argue thus, Points of belief in themſelves fundamental, are more requiſite to be preached than thoſe which are not ſo: (this is evident.) But the Apoſtles have put into their Creed ſome points that are not in themſelves fundamental: (ſo you confeſs, *ubi ſupra.*) Therefore if they have put in all, moſt requiſite to be preached, they have put in all, that in themſelves are fundamental. Thirdly and laſtly, from your own words Sect. 26. thus I conclude my purpoſe, *The Apoſtles intention was, particularly to deliver in the Creed ſuch Articles as were fitteſt for thoſe times, concerning the Deity, Trinity, and Meſſias*; (thus you, now I ſubſume,) but all points ſimply neceſſary, by vertue of Gods command, to be preached and believed in particular, were as fit for thoſe times as theſe here mentioned; therefore their intention was, to deliver in it particularly all the neceſſary points of belief.

23. And certainly he that conſiders the matter adviſedly, either muſt ſay that the Apoſtles were not the Authors of it, or that this was their deſign in compoſing it, or that they had none at all. For whereas you ſay, *their intent was, to comprehend in it ſuch general heads as were moſt befitting and requiſite for preaching the faith*; and elſewhere, *Particularly to deliver ſuch Articles as were fitteſt for thoſe times*; Every wiſe man may eaſily ſee that your deſire here was, to eſcape away in a cloud of indefinite terms. For otherwiſe, inſtead of ſuch general heads, and ſuch Articles,

Why

why did not you ſay plainly, all ſuch, or ſome ſuch? This had been plain dealing, but I fear, croſs to your deſign: which yet you have failed of. For that which you have ſpoken (though you are loath to ſpeak out,) either ſignifies nothing at all; or that which I and D. *Potter* affirm: *viz.* That the Apoſtles Creed contains all thoſe points of belief, which were by Gods command, of neceſſity to be preached to all, and believed by all. Neither when I ſay ſo, would I be ſo miſtaken, as if I ſaid, that all points in the Creed are thus neceſſary: For Punies in Logick, know that univerſal affirmatives, are not ſimply converted. And therefore it may be true, that all ſuch neceſſary points, are in the Creed; though it be not true, that all points in the Creed are thus neceſſary: which I willingly grant, of the points by you mentioned. But this rather confirms, than any way invalidates my aſſertion. For how could it ſtand with the Apoſtles wiſdom, to put in any points circumſtantial and not neceſſary, and at the ſame time, to leave out any that were eſſential and neceſſary for that end, which you ſay they propoſed to themſelves, in making the Creed, that is, *The preaching of the Faith, to Jews and Gentiles?*

31. Ad §. 11.12,13,14,15. Obj. *Summaries and Abſtracts are not intended to ſpecifie all the particulars of the ſcience or ſubject to which they belong.*

Anſ. Yes if they be intended for perfect Summaries, they muſt not omit any neceſſary doctrin of that Science whereof they are Summaries; though the Illuſtration and Reaſons of it they may omit. If this were not ſo, a man might ſet down forty or fifty of the Principal definitions and diviſions, and rules of Logick, and call it a Summary or Abſtract of Logick. But ſure, this were no more a Summary, than that were the picture of a man in little, that wanted any of the parts of a man; or that a total ſum wherein all the particulars were not caſt up. Now the Apoſtles Creed you here intimate that it was intended for a Summary: otherwiſe why talk you here of Sūmaries, and tell us that they need not contain all the particulars of their Science? And of what I pray may it be a Sum-

Summary, but of the Fundamentals of Christian Faith? Now you have already told us, *That it is most full and compleat to that purpose for which it was intended.* Lay all this together, and I believe the product will be; That the Apostles Creed is a perfect Summary of the Fundamentals of the Christian Faith: and what the duty of a perfect Summary is, I have already told you.

32. Whereas therefore to disprove this Assertion, in divers particles of this Chapter, but especially the Fourteenth, you muster up whole Armies of Doctrines, which you pretend are necessary, and not contained in the Creed; I answer very briefly thus: That the Doctrines you mention, are either concerning matters of practice, and not simple belief; or else they are such Doctrines wherein God has not so plainly revealed himself, but that honest and good men, true Lovers of God and of Truth, those that desire above all things to know his will and do it, may Err, and yet commit no sin at all, or only a sin of infirmity, and not destructive of Salvation; or lastly, they are such Doctrines which God hath plainly revealed, and so are necessary to be believed when they are known to be Divine, but not necessary to be known and believed, not necessary to be known for Divine, that they may be believed. Now all these sorts of Doctrines are impertinent to the present Question.

33. First, the Questions touching the Conditions to be performed by us to obtain remission of sins; the Sacraments; the Commandments, and the possibility of keeping them, the necessity of imploring the Assistance of Gods Grace and Spirit for the keeping of them: how far obedience is due to the Church: Prayer for the Dead: The cessation of the Old Law: are all about *Agenda*, and so cut off upon the first consideration.

34. Secondly, the Question touching Fundamentals, is profitable but not Fundamental. He that believes all Fundamentals, cannot be damned for any Error in Faith, though he believe more or less to be Fundamental than is so. That also of the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son: of Purgatory; of the Churches

Viſibility: of the Books of the *New Teſtament* which were doubted of by a conſiderable part of the Primitive Church: (until I ſee better reaſon for the contrary than the bare authority of men,) I ſhall eſteem of the ſame condition.

35. Thirdly, Theſe Doctrines that *Adam* and the Angels ſinned: that there are Angels good and bad: that thoſe Books of Scripture which were never doubted of by any conſiderable part of the Church, are the word of God: that S. *Peter* had no ſuch primacy as you pretend: that the Scripture is a perfect rule of Faith, aad conſequently that no neceſſary Doctrine is unwritten: that there is no one Society or ſucceſſion of Chriſtians abſolutely Infallible: Theſe to my underſtanding are truths plainly revealed by God, and neceſſary to be believed by them who know they are ſo. But not ſo neceſſary, that every Man and Woman is bound under pain of damnation particularly to know them to be Divine Revelations, and explicitely to believe them. And for this reaſon, theſe with innumerable other points, are to be referred to the third ſort of Doctrines above mentioned, which were never pretended to have place in the Creed. There remains one only point of all that Army you Muſtred together, reducible to none of theſe Heads, and that is, that God is, and is a Remunerator, which you ſay is queſtioned by the denial of merit. But if there were ſuch a neceſſary indiſſoluble coherence between this point and the Doctrine of merit, methinks with as much reaſon, and more charity you might conclude, That we hold merit, becauſe we hold this point; Then that we deny this point, becauſe we deny merit. Beſide, when *Proteſtants* deny the Doctrine of Merits, you know right well, for ſo they have declared themſelves a thouſand times, that they mean nothing elſe, but with *David*, that *their well doing extendeth not, is not truly beneficial to God:* with our Saviour, *when they have done all which they are commanded, they have done their duty only,* and no courteſie: And laſtly, with S. *Paul*, that *all which they can ſuffer for God* (and yet ſuffering is more than doing) *is not worthy to be compared*

pared to the glory that shall be revealed. So that you must either misunderstand their meaning in denying Merit, or you must discharge their Doctrine of this odious consequence, or you must charge it upon *David* and *Paul* and *Christ* himself. Nay you must either grant their denial of true Merit just and reasonable, or you must say, that our good actions are really profitable to God: that they are not debts already due to him, but voluntary and undeserved Favours: and that they are equal unto and well worthy of Eternal Glory which is prepared for them. As for the inconvenience which you so much fear, That the denial of Merit makes God a giver only, and not a rewarder; I tell you, good Sir, you fear where no fear is, and that it is both most true on the one side, that you in holding good Works meritorious of Eternal Glory make God a rewarder only and not a giver, contrary to plain Scripture, affirming that *The gift of God is Eternal Life*; And that it is most false on the other side, that the Doctrine of *Protestants* makes God a giver only and not a rewarder: In as much as their Doctrine is, That God gives not Heaven but to those which do something for it, and so his gift is also a Reward; but withal that whatsoever they do is due unto God beforehand, and worth nothing to God, and worth nothing in respect of Heaven, and so Mans work is no Merit, and Gods reward is still a Gift.

36. Put the case the *Pope*, for a reward of your Service done him in writing this Book, had given you the Honour and means of a Cardinal, would you not, not only in humility but in sincerity have professed, that you had not merited such a reward? And yet the *Pope* is neither your Creator nor Redeemer, nor Preserver, nor perhaps your very great Benefactor, sure I am, not so great as God Almighty, and therefore hath no such right and title to your Service as God hath in respect of precedent obligations. Besides, the work you have done him hath been really advantagious to him: and lastly, not altogether unproportionable to the forementioned reward. And therefore if by the same work you will pretend that either you have or hope to have deserved immortal

Happineſs, I beſeech you conſider well whether this be not to ſet a higher value upon a Cardinals Cap, than a Crown of immortal Glory, and with that Cardinal to prefer a part in *Paris* before a part in *Paradiſe.*

37. As for your diſtinction, between Hereſies that have been, and Hereſies that are, and Hereſies that may be, I have already proved it vain; and that whatſoever may be an Hereſie, that is ſo; and whatſoever is ſo, that always hath been ſo, ever ſince the publication of the Goſpel of Chriſt. The Doctrine of your Church may like a Snow-ball increaſe with rouling, and again if you pleaſe melt away and decreaſe: But as *Chriſt Jeſus*, ſo his Goſpel, *is yeſterday and to day, and the ſame for ever.*

38. Our Saviour ſending his Apoſtles to preach, gave them no other Commiſſion than this: *Go teach all Nations, Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt, teaching them to obſerve all things, whatſoever I have commanded you.* Theſe were the bounds of their Commiſſion. If your Church have any larger, or if ſhe have a Commiſſion at large, to teach what ſhe pleaſes, and call it the Goſpel of Chriſt, let her produce her Letters patents, from Heaven for it. But if this be all you have, then muſt you give me leave to eſteem it both great ſacriledg in you to forbid any thing, be it never ſo ſmall or ceremonious, which Chriſt hath commanded: as the receiving of the Communion in both kinds: and as high a degree of preſumption, to enjoyn men to believe, that there are or can be any other Fundamental Articles of the Goſpel of Chriſt, than what Chriſt himſelf commanded his Apoſtles to teach all men; or any damnable Hereſies, but ſuch as are plainly repugnant to theſe prime Verities.

39. Ad §. 16, 17.] The ſaying of the moſt Learned *Prelate* and excellent man the *Arch-Biſhop* of *Armach* (which ſhall be ſet down at the end of *N.* 43.) is as great and as good a Truth, and as neceſſary for theſe miſerable times as can poſſibly be uttered: For this is moſt certain, and I believe you will eaſily grant it, that to reduce Chriſtians to Unity of Communion, there are but two ways

tha

that may be conceived probable: The one, by taking away diverſity of opinions touching matters of Religion: The other by ſhewing that the diverſity of Opinions, which is among the ſeveral Sects of Chriſtians, ought to be no hindrance to their Unity in Communion.

40. Now the former of theſe is not to be hoped for without a miracle, unleſs that could be done, which is impoſſible to be performed, though it be often pretended; that is, unleſs it could be made evident to all men, that God hath appointed ſome viſible Judge of Controverſies, to whoſe judgment all men are to ſubmit themſelves. What then remains, but that the other way muſt be taken, and Chriſtians muſt be taught to ſet a higher value upon theſe high points of Faith and obedience wherein they agree, than upon theſe matters of leſs moment wherein they differ, and underſtand that agreement in thoſe, ought to be more effectual to joyn them in one Communion, than their difference in other things of leſs moment to divide them? When I ſay, *in one Communion*, I mean, in a common Profeſſion of thoſe articles of Faith, wherein all conſent: A joynt worſhip of God, after ſuch a way as all eſteem lawful; and a mutual performance of all thoſe works of Charity, which Chriſtians owe one to another. And to ſuch a Communion what better inducement could be thought of, than to demonſtrate that what was Univerſally believed of all Chriſtians, if it were joyned with a love of truth, and with holy obedience, was ſufficient to bring men to Heaven? For why ſhould men be more rigid than God? Why ſhould any Error exclude any man from the Churches Communion, which will not deprive him of Eternal Salvation? Now that Chriſtians do generally agree in all thoſe points of Doctrine, which are neceſſary to Salvation, it is apparent, becauſe they agree with one accord, in believing all thoſe Books of the *Old* and *New Teſtament*, which in the Church were never doubted of to be the undoubted Word of God. And it is ſo certain that in all theſe Books, all neceſſary Doctrines are evidently contained, that of all the four Evangeliſts this is ve-

ry

ry probable, but of S. *Luke* moſt apparent, that in every one of their Books they have comprehended the whole ſubſtance of the Goſpel of Chriſt. For what reaſon can be imagined, that any of them ſhould leave out any thing which he knew to be neceſſary, and yet (as apparently all of them have done) put in many things which they knew to be only profitable and not neceſſary? What wiſe and honeſt man that were now to write the Goſpel of Chriſt, would do ſo great a work of God after ſuch a negligent faſhion? Suppoſe *Xaverius* had been to write the Goſpel of Chriſt for the *Indians*, think you he would have left out any Fundamental Doctrine of it? If not, I muſt beſeech you to conceive as well of S. *Matthew*, and S. *Mark*, and S. *Luke*, and S. *John*, as you do of *Xaverius*. Beſides, if every one of them have not in them all neceſſary Doctrines, how have they complied with their own deſign, which was, as the Titles of their Books ſhew, to write *the Goſpel of Chriſt*, and not a part of it? Or how have they not deceived us, in giving them ſuch Titles? By the whole Goſpel of Chriſt, I underſtand not the whole Hiſtory of Chriſt, but all that makes up the Covenant between God and Man. Now if this be wholly contained in the Goſpel of Saint *Mark* and Saint *John*, I believe every conſidering man will be inclinable to believe that then without doubt, it is contained, with the advantage of many other very profitable things, in the larger Goſpels of Saint *Matthew*, and Saint *Luke*. And that Saint *Marks* Goſpel wants no neceſſary Article of this Covenant, I preſume you will not deny, if you believe *Irenæus* when he ſays, *Matthew to the* Hebrews *in their Tongue publiſhed the Scripture of the Goſpel: When* Peter *and* Paul *did Preach the Goſpel, and found the Church or a Church at* Rome, *or of* Rome, *and after their departure* Mark *the Scholar of* Peter, *delivered to us in writing thoſe things which had been Preached by* Peter; *and* Luke, *the follower of* Paul, *compiled in a Book the Goſpel which was Preached by him: And afterwards* John, *reſiding in* Aſia, *in the City of* Ephſeus, *did himſelf alſo ſet forth a Goſpel.*

41. In

41. In which words of *Irenæus*, it is remarkable that they are ſpoken by him againſt ſome Hereticks, that pretended (as you know who do now adaies) that *ſome neceſſary Doctrines of the Goſpel were unwritten*, and that *out of the Scriptures, truth* (he muſt mean ſufficient truth,) *cannot be found by thoſe which know not Tradition.* Againſt whom to ſay, that part of the Goſpel which was Preached by S *Peter* was written by S *Mark*, and ſo other neceſſary parts of it omitted, had been to ſpeak impertinently, and rather to confirm than confute their Error. It is plain therefore, that he muſt mean, as I pretend, that all the neceſſary Doctrine of the Goſpel, which was Preached by Saint *Peter*, was written by Saint *Mark*. Now you will not deny, I preſume, that Saint *Peter*, Preached all, therefore you muſt not deny that S. *Mark* wrote all. *Lib.* 3. *c.* 2.

42. Our next inquiry let it be touching S. *Johns* intent in writing his Goſpel, whether it were to deliver ſo much truth, as being believed and obeyed would certainly bring men to Eternal Life, or only part of it, and to leave part unwritten? A great man there is, but much leſs than the Apoſtle, who ſaith, that *writing laſt, he purpoſed to ſupply the defects of the other Evangeliſts, that had wrote before him:* which (if it were true) would ſufficiently juſtifie what I have undertaken, that at leaſt all the four Evangeliſts have in them, all the neceſſary parts of the Goſpel of Chriſt. Neither will I deny, but S. *Johns* ſecondary intent might be to ſupply the defects of the former three Goſpels, in ſome things very profitable. But he that pretends, that any neceſſary Doctrine is in S. *John* which is in none of the other Evangeliſts, hath not ſo well conſidered them as he ſhould do, before he pronounce ſentence of ſo weighty a matter. And for his prime intent in writing his Goſpel, what that was, certainly no Father in the World underſtood it better than himſelf. Therefore let us hear him ſpeak: *Many other ſigns* (ſaith he) *alſo did Jeſus in the ſight of his Diſciples, which are not written in this Book: But theſe are written, that you may believe that Jeſus is Chriſt the Son of God, and that believing you may have Life in his name.*

By

By (*theſe are written*) may be underſtood, either *theſe things* are written, or *theſe ſigns* are written. Take it which way you will, this concluſion will certainly follow, That either all that which S. *John* wrote in his Goſpel, or leſs than all, and therefore all much more was ſufficient to make them believe that which being believed with lively Faith, would certainly bring them to Eternal Life.

43. This which hath been ſpoken (I hope) is enough to juſtifie my undertaking to the full, that it is very probable that every one of the four Evangeliſts has in his Book the whole ſubſtance, all the neceſſary parts of the Goſpel of Chriſt. But for Saint *Luke*, that he hath written ſuch a perfect Goſpel, in my judgment it ought to be with them that believe him, no manner of queſtion. Conſider firſt the introduction to his Goſpel, where he declares what he intends to write, in theſe Words, *For as much as many have taken in hand to ſet forth in order a Declaration of theſe things, which are moſt ſurely believed amongſt us, even as they delivered unto us, which from the beginning were Eye-witneſſes, and Miniſters of the Word, it ſeemed good to me alſo, having had perfect underſtanding of things from the firſt, to write to thee in order, moſt excellent* Theophilus, *that thou mighteſt know the certainty, of thoſe things wherein thou haſt been inſtructed.* Add to this place, the entrance to his *Hiſtory of the* Acts *of the Apoſtles: The former Treatiſe have I made,* O Theophilus, *of all that Jeſus began both to do and teach, until the day in which he was taken up.* Weigh well theſe two places, and then anſwer me freely and ingenuouſly to theſe demands. 1. Whether S. *Luke* does not undertake the very ſame thing which he ſays, *many had taken in hand?* 2. Whether this were not *to ſet forth in order, a Declaration of thoſe things which are moſt ſurely believed amongſt Chriſtians?* 3. Whether the whole Goſpel of Chriſt, and every neceſſary Doctrine of it, were not ſurely believed among Chriſtians? 4. Whether they which were *Eye-witneſſes and Miniſters of the Word from the beginning, delivered not the whole Goſpel of Chriſt?* 5. Whether he does not undertake to write in order theſe things

things *whereof he had perfect underſtanding* from the firſt? 6. Whether he had not perfect underſtanding of the whole Goſpel of Chriſt? 7. Whether he doth not undertake to write to *Theophilus* of all thoſe things *wherein he had been inſtructed?* 8. And whether he had not been inſtructed in all the neceſſary parts of the Goſpel of Chriſt? 9. Whether in the other Text, *All things which Jeſus began to do and teach,* muſt not at leaſt imply, all the principal and neceſſary things? 10. Whether this be not the very interpretation of your *Rhemiſh* Doctors, in their Annotation upon this place? 11. Whether all theſe Articles of the Chriſtian Faith, without the belief whereof, no man can be ſaved, be not the principal and moſt neceſſary things which *Jeſus* taught? 12. And laſtly, whether many things which S. *Luke* has wrote in his Goſpel, be not leſs principal, and leſs neceſſary than all and every one of theſe? When you have well conſidered theſe propoſals, I believe you will be very apt to think (if S. *Luke* be of credit with you) That all things neceſſary to ſalvation, are certainly contained in his writings alone. And from hence you will not chooſe but conclude, that ſeeing all the Chriſtians in the world, agree in the belief of what S. *Luke* hath written, and not only ſo, but in all other Books of Canonical Scripture, which were never doubted of in and by the Church, the Learned Arch-Biſhop had very juſt, and certain ground to ſay, *That in theſe Propoſitions, which without Controverſie are univerſally received in the whole Chriſtian world, ſo much truth is contained, as being joyned with holy obedience, may be ſufficient to bring a man to everlaſting Salvation; and that we have no cauſe to doubt, but that as many as walk according to this rule, neither overthrowing that which they have builded, by ſuperinducing any damnable Hereſie thereupon, nor otherwiſe vitiating their holy faith, with a lewd and wicked converſation, peace ſhall be upon them, and upon the Iſrael of God.*

44. Againſt this, you object two things. The one, that by this Rule, *ſeeing the Doctrin of the Trinity is not received univerſally among Chriſtians, the denial of it ſhall not exclude Salvation.* The other, that the *Biſhop contradicts him-*

ſelf, in ſuppoſing a man may believe all neceſſary Truths, and yet ſuperinduce ſome damnable Hereſies.

45. To the firſt I anſwer, what I conceive he would, whoſe words I here juſtify, that he hath declared plainly in this very place, that he meant, not an abſolute, but a limited Univerſality, and ſpeaks not of propoſitions univerſally believed by all Profeſſions of Chriſtianity that are, but only, by all thoſe ſeveral Profeſſions of Chriſtianity, that have any large ſpread in *any part of the world.* By which words he excludes from the univerſality here ſpoken of, the denyers of the Doctrin of the Trinity, as being but a handful of men, in reſpect of all, nay in reſpect of any of theſe profeſſions which maintain it. And therefore it was a great fault in you, either willingly to conceal theſe words, which evacuate your objection, or elſe negligently to overſee them.

46. Now for the foul Contradiction, wherein I pray does it lie? *In ſuppoſing* (ſay you) *a man may believe all Truths neceſſary to ſalvation, and yet ſuperinduce a damnable Hereſie.* I anſwer, It is not certain that his words do ſuppoſe this: neither if they do, does he contradict himſelf. I ſay it is not certain that his words import any ſuch matter. For ordinarily men uſe to ſpeak and write ſo as here he does, when they intend not to limit or reſtrain, but only to repeat and preſs and illuſtrate what they have ſaid before.

S. *Athanaſius* in his Creed tells us, *The Catholick Faith is this, that we worſhip one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity, neither confounding the Perſons nor dividing the Subſtance*; and why now do you not tell him that he contradicts himſelf, and ſuppoſes that we may worſhip a Trinity of Perſons, and one God in ſubſtance, and yet confound the Perſons, or divide the Subſtance; which yet is impoſſible, becauſe Three remaining Three, cannot be confounded, and One remaining One cannot be divided? If a man ſhould ſay unto you, he that keeps all the Commandments of God, committing no ſin either againſt the love of God, or the love of his neighbour, is a perfect man: Or thus, he that will live in conſtant health had need be exact in his diet, neither eating too much, nor too little: Or thus, he that

that will come to *London* muſt go on ſtraight forward in ſuch a way, und neither turn to the right hand or to the left; I verily believe you would not find any contradiction in his words, but confeſs them as coherent and conſonant as any in your Book. And certainly if you would look upon this ſaying of the Biſhop with any indifference, you would eaſily perceive it to be of the very ſame kind, and capable of the very ſame conſtruction. And therefore one of the grounds of your accuſation is uncertain; Neither can you aſſure us, that the Biſhop ſuppoſes any ſuch matter as you pretend. Neither if he did ſuppoſe this (as perhaps he did) were this to contradict himſelf. For though there can be no damnable Hereſie, unleſs it contradict ſome neceſſary Truth, yet there is no contradiction but the ſame man may at once believe this Hereſie and this Truth; becauſe there is no contradiction that the ſame man, at the ſame time, ſhould believe contradictions. For, firſt, whatſoever a man believes true, that he may and muſt believe; but there have been ſome who have believed and taught that contradictions might be true, againſt whom *Ariſtotle* diſputes in the third of his *Metaphyſicks*; Therefore it is not impoſſible that a man may believe contradictions. Secondly, they which believe there is no certainty in Reaſon, muſt believe that contradictions may be true: For otherwiſe there will be certainty in this Reaſon; This contradicts Truth, therefore it is falſe. But there be now divers in the world who believe there is no certainty in reaſon, (and whether you be of their mind or no, I deſire to be informed;) Therefore there be divers in the world who believe contradictions may be true. Thirdly, They which do captivate their underſtandings to the belief of thoſe things which to their underſtanding ſeem irreconcileable contradictions, may as well believe real contradictions: (For the difficulty of believing ariſes not from their being repugnant, but from their ſeeming to be ſo:) But you do captivate your underſtandings to the belief of thoſe things which ſeem to your underſtandings irreconcileable contradictions; therefore it is as poſſible and eaſie for you to believe thoſe that indeed

are ſo. Fourthly, ſome men may be confuted in their Errors, and perſwaded out of them; but no mans Error can be confuted, who together with his Error doth not believe and grant ſome true principle that contradicts his Error: for nothing can be proved to him who grants nothing, neither can there be (as all men know) any rational diſcourſe but out of grounds agreed upon by both parts. Therefore it is not impoſſible but abſolutely certain, that the ſame man at the ſame time may believe contradictions. Fifthly, It is evident, neither can you without extream madneſs and uncharitableneſs, deny, that we believe the Bible, thoſe Books I mean which we believe Canonical: Otherwiſe why diſpute you with us out of them, as out of a common Principle? Either therefore you muſt retract your opinion, and acknowledge that the ſame man at the ſame time may believe contradictions, or elſe you will run into a greater inconvenience, and be forced to confeſs, that no part of our Doctrin contradicts the Bible. Sixthly, I deſire you to vindicate from contradiction theſe following Aſſertions: That there ſhould be Length, and nothing long: Breadth, and nothing broad: Thickneſs, and nothing thick: Whiteneſs, and nothing white: Roundneſs, and nothing round: Weight, and nothing heavy: Sweetneſs, and nothing ſweet: Moiſture, and nothing moiſt: Fluidneſs, and nothing flowing: many Actions, and no Agent: many Paſſions, and no Patient: That is, that there ſhould be a long, broad, thick, white, round, heavy, ſweet, moiſt, flowing, active, paſſive, nothing! That Bread ſhould be turned into the ſubſtance of Chriſt, and yet not any thing of the Bread become any thing of Chriſt; neither the matter, nor the form, nor the Accidents of Bread, be made either the matter or the Form, or the Accidents of Chriſt. That Bread ſhould be turned into nothing, and at the ſame time with the ſame action turned into Chriſt, and yet Chriſt ſhould not be nothing. That the ſame thing at the ſame time ſhould have its juſt dimenſions, and juſt diſtance of its parts, one from another, and at the ſame time not have it, but all its parts together in one and the ſelf ſame point. That the body of Chriſt,

Chriſt, which is much greater, ſhould be contained wholly and in its full dimenſions without any alteration, in that which is leſſer, and that not once only, but as many times over as there are ſeveral points in the bread and wine. That the ſame thing at the ſame time ſhould be wholly above it ſelf, and wholly below it ſelf, within it ſelf, and without it ſelf, on the right hand, and on the left hand, and round about it ſelf. That the ſame thing at the ſame time ſhould move to and from it ſelf, and lie ſtill: Or that it ſhould be carried from one place to another through the middle ſpace, and yet not move. That it ſhould be brought from Heaven to Earth, and yet not come out of Heaven, nor be at all in any of the middle ſpace between Heaven and Earth. That to be one, ſhould be to be undivided from it ſelf, and yet that one and the ſame thing ſhould be divided from it ſelf. That a thing may be, and yet be no where. That a Finite thing may be in all places at once. That a Body may be in a place, and have there its dimenſions, and colour, and all other qualities, and yet that it is not in the power of God to make it viſible, and tangible there, nor capable of doing or ſuffering any thing. That there ſhould be no certainty in our ſenſes, and yet that we ſhould know ſomething certainly, and yet know nothing but by our ſenſes. That that which is, and was long ago, ſhould now begin to be. That that is now to be made of nothing, which is not nothing but ſomething. That the ſame thing ſhould be before and after it ſelf. That it ſhould be truly and really in a place, and yet without Locality. Nay, that He which is Omnipotent ſhould not be able to give it Locality in this place, where it is, as ſome of you hold: or if he can, as others ſay he can, that it ſhould be poſſible, that the ſame man, for example You or I, may at the ſame time, be awake at *London*, & not awake but aſleep at *Rome*: There run or walk, here not run or walk, but ſtand ſtill, ſit, or lie along: There ſtudy or write, here do neither, but dine or ſup: There ſpeak, here be ſilent. That he may in one place freez for cold, in another burn with heat. That he may be drunk in one place, and ſober in another: Valiant in one place, and a Coward in another:

A thief in one place, honeſt in another. That he may be a *Papiſt* and go to *Maſs* in *Rome*; A *Proteſtant* and go to Church in *England*. That he may die in *Rome*, and live in *England*: or dying in both places may go to Hell from *Rome*, and to Heaven from *England*. That the Body and Soul of Chriſt ſhould ceaſe to be where it was, and yet not go to another place, nor be deſtroyed. All theſe, and many other of the like nature are the unavoidable, and moſt of them the acknowledged conſequences of your doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation, as is explained one where or other by your School-men. Now I beſeech you, Sir, to try your skill, and if you can compoſe their repugnance, and make peace between them; Certainly, none but you ſhall be *Catholick Moderator*. But if you cannot do it, and that after an intelligible manner, then you muſt give me leave to believe, that either you do not believe Tranſubſtantiation, or elſe that it is no contradiction, that men ſhould ſubjugate their underſtandings to the belief of contradictions.

48. Ad §. 18. This Paragraph conſiſts of two immodeſt untruths, obtruded upon us without ſhew, or ſhadow of reaſon: and an evident ſophiſm grounded upon an affected miſtake of the ſenſe of the word *Fundamental*.

49. The firſt untruth is, that *ſome Proteſtants make a Church, of men ſcarcely agreeing in one point of faith; of men concurring in ſome one or few Articles of belief, and in the reſt holding conceits plainly contradictory: agreeing only in this one Article, that Chriſt is our Saviour*; &c.

Anſ. This is a ſhameleſs Calumny; becauſe even theſe men to the conſtituting of the very eſſence of a Church, in the loweſt degree, require not only *Faith in Jeſus Chriſt the Son of God and Saviour of the World*, but alſo *ſubmiſſion to his Doctrin in mind and will*. Now I beſeech you Sir, tell me ingenuouſly, whether the Doctrin of Chriſt may be called without blaſphemy, *ſcarcely one point of Faith?* Or whether it conſiſts only, *of ſome one or few Articles of belief?* Or whether there be nothing in it, but only this Article, *That Chriſt is our Saviour?* Is it not manifeſt to all the world, that Chriſtians of all Profeſſions do agree with one conſent, in the belief of all thoſe Books of Scripture, which

which were not doubted of in the ancient Church, without danger of damnation? Nay is it not apparent, that no man at this time, can without hypocriſie, pretend to believe in Chriſt, but of neceſſity he muſt do ſo? Seeing he can have no reaſon to believe in Chriſt, but he muſt have the ſame to believe the Scripture. I pray then read over the Scripture once more, or if that be too much labour, the New Teſtament only: and then ſay whether there be nothing there, but *ſcarcely one point of Faith? But ſome one or two Articles of belief? Nothing but this Article only, that Chriſt is our Saviour?* Say whether there be not there an infinite number of Divine Verities, Divine precepts, Divine promiſes, and thoſe ſo plainly and undoubtedly delivered, that if any ſees them not, it cannot be becauſe he cannot, but becauſe he will not! So plainly, that whoſoever ſubmits ſincerely to the Doctrin of Chriſt, in mind and will, cannot poſſibly but ſubmit to theſe in act and performance. And in the reſt, which it hath pleaſed God, for reaſons beſt known to himſelf, to deliver obſcurely or ambiguouſly, yet thus far at leaſt they agree, that the ſenſe of them intended by God, is certainly true, and that they are without paſſion or prejudice to endeavor to find it out: The difference only is, which is that true ſenſe which God intended. Neither would this long continue, if the walls of ſeparation, whereby the Divel hopes to make their Diviſions eternal, were pulled down; and Error were not ſupported againſt Truth, by human advantages. But for the preſent, God forbid the matter ſhould be ſo ill as you make it! For whereas you looking upon their points of difference and agreement, through I know not what ſtrange glaſſes, have made the firſt innumerable, and the other ſcarce a number: the Truth is clean contrary; that thoſe divine Verities, Speculative and Practical, wherein they univerſally agree (which you will have to be but a few, or but one, or ſcarcely one) amount to *many millions*, (if an exact account were taken of them:) And on the other ſide, the Points in variance, are in compariſon but few, and thoſe not of ſuch a quality, but the Error in them may well conſiſt with the belief

and

and obedience of the entire Covenant, ratified by Chriſt between God and man. Yet I would not be ſo miſtaken, as if I thought the Errors even of ſome *Proteſtants* unconſiderable things, and matters of no moment. For the truth is, I am very fearful, that ſome of their opinions, either as they are, or as they are apt to be miſtaken, (though not of themſelves ſo damnable, but that good and holy men may be ſaved with them, yet) are too frequent occaſions of our remiſneſs, and ſlackneſs, in running the race of Chriſtian Perfection, of our deferring Repentance, and converſion to God, of our frequent relapſes into ſin, and not ſeldom of ſecurity in ſinning; and conſequently, though not certain cauſes, yet too frequent occaſions of many mens damnation: and ſuch I conceive all theſe Doctrines which either directly or obliquely, put men in hope of Eternal happineſs, by any other means ſaving only the narrow way *of ſincere and Univerſal obedience*, grounded upon a true and lively Faith. Theſe Errors therefore, I do not elevate or extenuate: and on condition the ruptures made by them might be compoſed, do heartily wiſh, that the cement were made of my deareſt Blood, and only not to be an *Anathema* from Chriſt! Only this I ſay, that neither are their points of agreement ſo few, nor their differences ſo many, as you make them, nor ſo great as to exclude the oppoſite Parties from being members of one Church Militant, and Joynt Heirs of the Glory of the Church Triumphant.

50. Your other palpable untruth is, that *Proteſtants are far more bold to diſagree even in matters of Faith, than Catholick Divines* (you mean your own,] *in Queſtions meerly Philoſophical, or not determined by the Church.* For neither do they differ at all, in *matters of Faith*, if you take the word in the higheſt ſenſe, and mean by matters of Faith, ſuch Doctrines as are *abſolutely neceſſary* to Salvation, to be believed or not to be disbelieved. And then in thoſe wherein they do differ, with what colour or ſhadow of Argument, can you make good, that *they are more bold to diſagree, than you are in Queſtions meerly Philoſophical, or not determined by the Church?* For is there not as great repug-

pugnancy between your assent and dissent, your affirmation and negation, your *Est Est, Non Non*, as there is between theirs? You follow your Reason, in those things which are not determined by your Church; and they theirs, in things not plainly determined in Scripture. And wherein then consists their greater, *their far greater boldness?* And what if they in their contradictory opinions, pretend both to rely upon the truth of God, doth this make their contradictions ever a whit the more repugnant? I had always thought, that all contradictions had been equally contradictions, and equally repugnant; because the least of them are as far asunder, as *Est* and *Non Est* can make them, and the greatest are no farther. But then you in your differences, (by name, about Predetermination, the Immaculate Conception, the *Popes* Infallibility,) upon what other motive do you rely? Do not you cite Scripture, or Tradition, or both, on both sides? And do you not pretend, that both these are the infallible Truths of Almighty God?

51. You close up this Section with a fallacy, proving forsooth, that *we destroy, by our confession, the Church which is the House of God, because we stand only upon Fundamental Articles, which cannot make up the whole Fabrick of the Faith, no more than the Foundation of a House alone can be a House.*

52. But I hope, Sir, you will not be difficult in granting, that that is a House which hath all the necessary parts belonging to a House: now by Fundamental Articles, we mean all those which are necessary; and then I hope you will grant that we may safely expect Salvation in a Church, which hath all things Fundamental to Salvation; Unless you will say, that more is necessary, than that which is necessary.

53. Ad §. 19.] This long discourse is to shew that *Protestants give unavoidable occasion of desperation to poor Souls*, and brings in a Man desirous to save his Soul, asking Questions of *D. P.* and makes answers for him. As first, if he required, *whose directions he might rely upon?* He says, the Doctor's Answer would be, *upon the truly Catholick Church.*

But I ſuppoſe upon better reaſon, becauſe I know his mind, that he would adviſe him to *call no man Maſter upon Earth*, but according to Chriſts command, to rely upon the *direction of God himſelf*. If he ask, where he ſhould find this direction? he would anſwer him, *In his Word contained in Scripture*. If he ſhould inquire what aſſurance he might have that the *Scripture is the Word of God*? He would anſwer him, that the Doctrine it ſelf is very fit and worthy to be thought to come from God, (*nec vox hominem ſonat*) and that they which wrote and delivered it, confirmed it to be the Word of God, by doing ſuch works as could not be done, but by Power from God himſelf. For aſſurance of the Truth hereof, he would adviſe him to rely upon that which all Wiſe Men, in all matters of belief rely upon; and that is, the conſent of Ancient records, and Univerſal Tradition. No Wiſe Man doubts but there was ſuch a man as *Julius Cæſar*, or *Cicero*, that there are ſuch Cities as *Rome* or *Conſtantinople*, though he have no other aſſurance for the one or the other, but only the *ſpeech* of People. This Tradition therefore he would counſel him to rely upon, and to believe that the Book which we call Scripture, was confirmed abundantly by the Works of God, to be the Word of God. Believing it the Word of God, he muſt of neceſſity believe it true: and if he believe it true, he muſt believe it contains all neceſſary directions unto Eternal Happineſs, becauſe it affirms it ſelf to do ſo. Nay he might tell him, that ſo far is the whole Book, from wanting any neceſſary direction to his Eternal Salvation, that one only Author, that hath writ but two little Books of it, Saint *Luke* by name in the beginning of his *Goſpel*, and in the beginning of his *Story*, ſhews plainly that he alone hath written at leaſt ſo much as is neceſſary. And what they wrote, they wrote by Gods direction, for the direction of the World, not only for the Learned, but for all that would do their true endeavour to know the will of God, and to do it; therefore you cannot but conceive, that writing to all and for all, they wrote ſo as that in things neceſſary they might be underſtood by all. Beſides that,

here

here he should find, that God himself has engaged himself by promise, that if he would love him, and keep his Commandments, and pray earnestly for his Spirit, and be willing to be directed by it, he should undoubtedly receive it, even the *Spirit of Truth which shall lead him into all Truth*; that is certainly, into all necessary Truths, and suffer him to fall into no pernitious Error. The sum of his whole direction to him briefly would be this, Believe the Scripture to be the Word of God, use your true endeavour to find the true sense of it, and to live according to it, and then you may rest securely that you are in the true way to Eternal Happiness. This is the substance of that Answer which the Doctor would make to any man in this case; and this is a way so plain, that Fools, unless they will, cannot Err from it. Because not knowing absolutely all truth, nay not all profitable truth, and not being free from Error; but endeavouring to know the truth and obey it, and endeavouring to be free from Error, is by this way made the only condition of Salvation.

56. Neither is this to drive any man to desparation; unless it be such a one as hath such a strong affection to this word, *Church*, that he will not go to Heaven, *unless he hath a Church to lead him thither.* For what though a Council may Err, and the whole Church cannot be consulted with, yet this is not to send you on the Fools *Pilgrimage for Faith*, and bid you go and *confer with every Christian Soul, Man and Woman, by Sea and by Land, close Prisoner, or at Liberty*, as you dilate the matter: But to tell you very briefly, that Universal Tradition directs you to the Word of God, and the Word of God directs you to Heaven.

57. To the next demand, *How shall I know whether he hold all Fundamental points or no?* When *Protestants* answer, *If he truly believe the undoubted Books of Canonical Scripture, he cannot but believe all Fundamentals*, and that it is *very probable* that the *Creed contains all the Fundamentals of simple belief:* The Jesuite takes no notice of the former, but takes occasion from the latter to ask. *Shall I hazard my Soul*

on Probabilities, or even Wagers? As if whatſoever is but probable, though in the higheſt degree of Probability, were as likely to be falſe as true! or becauſe it is but *Morally*, not Mathematically certain, that there was ſuch a Woman as *Q. Elizabeth*, ſuch a man as *Hen.* the 8*th.* that is in the higheſt degree probable, therefore it were an even Wager there were none ſuch! By this Reaſon ſeeing the truth of your whole Religion depends finally upon *Prudential motives*, which you do but pretend to be very credible, it will be *an even Wager that your Religion is falſe.* And by the ſame Reaſon, or rather infinitely greater, ſeeing it is impoſſible for any man (according to the grounds of your Religion) to know himſelf, much leſs another to be a true *Pope*, or a true Prieſt; nay to have a Moral certainty of it, becauſe theſe things are obnoxious to innumerable ſecret and undiſcernable nullities, it will be an even Wager, nay (if we proportion things indifferently, a hundred to one, that every Conſecration and Abſolution of yours is void, and that whenſoever you adore the Hoſt, you and your Aſſiſtants commit Idolatry: That there is a nullity in any decree that a *Pope* ſhall make, or any Decree of a Council which he ſhall confirm: Particularly it will be at leaſt an even Wager, that all the decrees of the Council of *Trent* are void, becauſe it is at moſt but very probable that the *Pope* which confirmed them was true *Pope.*

62. *Obj.* But *unleſs this Queſtion be anſwered,* (what points of the Creed are, and what are not Fundamentals?) *the* Proteſtant *Doctrine ſerves only either to make men deſpare, or elſe to have recourſe to thoſe called* Papiſts.

Anſw. It ſeems a little thing will make you deſpair, if you be ſo ſullen as to do ſo, becauſe men will not trouble themſelves to ſatisfie your curious queſtions. And I pray be not offended with me for ſo eſteeming it, becauſe as before I told you, if you will believe all the points of the Creed, you cannot chooſe but believe all the points of it that are Fundamental, though you be ignorant which are ſo, and which are not ſo. Now I believe your deſire to know which are Fundamentals, proceeds only

only from a desire to be assured that you do believe them; which seeing you may be assured of, without knowing which they be, what can it be but curiosity to desire to know it? Neither may you think to mend your self herein one whit by having recourse to them whom we call *Papists*; for they are as far to seek as we in this point, which of the Articles of the Creed are, for their nature and matter, Fundamental, and which are not. Particularly, you will scarce meet with any amongst their Doctors, so adventurous, as to tell you for a certain, whether or no the conception of Christ by the Holy Ghost, his being born of a Virgin, his Burial, his descent into Hell, and the Communion of Saints, be points of their own nature and matter Fundamental. Such I mean, as without the distinct and explicite knowledge of them no man can be saved.

63. *Obj.* We give this certain Rule, *that all points defined by Christs Visible Church, belong to the Foundation of Faith, in this sense, that to deny any such, cannot stand with Salvation.*

Answ. So also Protestants give you this more certain rule, That whosoever believes heartily those Books of Scripture, which all the Christian Churches in the World acknowledge to be Canonical, and submits himself indeed to this, as to the rule of his belief, must of necessity believe all things Fundamental, and if he live according to his Faith, cannot fail of Salvation. But besides, what certainty have you, that that rule of *Papists* is so certain? By the visible Church it is plain, they mean only their own: and why their own only should be the Visible Church, I do not understand: and as little, why all points defined by this Church should belong to the Foundation of Faith. These things you had need see well and substantially proved, before you rely upon them, otherwise you expose your self to danger of imbracing damnable Errors instead of Fundamental Truths.

67. Ad §. 23, 24, 25.] *D. P.* demands, *How it can be necessary for any Christian, to have more in his Creed than the Apostles had.* And this he enforces with many Arguments

ments, thus. *May the Church of after Ages make the narrow way to heaven, narrower than our Saviour left it? Shall it be a fault to ſtraiten and encomber the Kings high way with publick nuiſances; and is it lawful by adding new Articles to the Faith, to retrench any thing from the Latitude of the King of Heavens high way to Eternal happineſs? The Yoak of Chriſt, which he ſaid was eaſie, may it be juſtly made heavier by the Governors of the Church in after Ages? The Apoſtles profeſs they revealed to the Church the whole Counſel of God, keeping back nothing needful for our Salvation. What Tyranny then to impoſe any new unneceſſary matters on the Faith of Chriſtians, eſpecially (as the late* Popes *have done) under the high commanding form,* Qui non crediderit, damnabitur? *He that believeth not, ſhall be damned. If this may be done, why then did our Saviour reprehend the Phariſees ſo ſharply, for binding heavy burdens, and laying them on mens ſhoulders? And why did he teach them, that in vain they worſhiped God, teaching for Doctrines mens Traditions? And why did the Apoſtles call it tempting of God, to lay thoſe things upon the Necks of Chriſtians, that were not neceſſary?*

68. All which interrogations ſeem to me to contain ſo many plain and convincing Arguments of the premiſed Aſſertion; and if you can deviſe no fair and ſatisfying anſwer to them, then be ſo ingenuous as to grant the Concluſion, *That no more can be neceſſary for Chriſtians to believe now, than was in the Apoſtles time.* A concluſion of great importance, for the deciding of many Controverſies, and the disburdening of the Faith of Chriſt from many incumbrances.

70. The Doctor to make good this concluſion argues further thus, S. *Paul* declared to the *Epheſians* the whole Counſel of God touching their Salvation. Therefore that which S. *Paul* did not declare, can be no part of the Counſel of God, and therefore not neceſſary. And again; S. *Paul* kept back nothing from the *Epheſians* that was profitable; Therefore he taught them all things neceſſary to Salvation.

71. Neither is it material, that theſe words were particularly directed by S. *Paul*, to the Paſtours of the Church: For

For (to ſay nothing that the point here iſſuable, is not, Whom he taught, whether Prieſts or *Laymen?* But how much he taught, and whether all things neceſſary?) it appears plainly out of the Text, and I wonder you ſhould read it ſo negligently as not to obſerve it, that though he ſpeaks now to the Paſtors, yet he ſpeaks of what he taught not only them, but alſo the Laity as well as them. *I have kept back nothing* (ſays S. *Paul*) *that was profitable, but have ſhewed, and have taught you publickly, and from Houſe to Houſe; Teſtifying* (I pray obſerve) *both to the* Jews, *and alſo to the* Greeks *Repentance towards God, and Faith towards our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* And a little after, *I know that ye all, among whom I have gone Preaching the Kingdom of God, ſhall ſee my Face no more: Wherefore I take you to record this day, that I am Innocent from the Blood of all men; for I have kept nothing back, but have ſhewed you all the Counſel of God.* And again, *Remember that by the ſpace of three Years I ceaſed not to warn every one Night and Day with Tears.* Certainly though he did all theſe things to the Paſtors among the reſt, nay above the reſt, yet without Controverſie, they whom he taught publickly, and from Houſe to Houſe: The *Jews* and *Greeks* to whom he *Teſtified* (i. e.) *Preached* Faith and Repentance: Thoſe all, amongſt whom he went preaching the Kingdom of God: Thoſe, Every one, whom for three Years together he warned, were not Biſhops and Paſtors only.

72. Neither is this to ſay, that the Apoſtles taught Chriſtians nothing but their Creed, nothing of the Sacraments, Commandments, *&c.* for that is not here the point to be proved: but only, that they taught them all things neceſſary, ſo that nothing can be neceſſary which they did not teach them. But how much of this they put into their Creed, whether *all the neceſſary points of ſimple belief*, as we pretend, or only as you ſay, *I know not what*, is another Queſtion now to be examined.

73. We urge againſt you, *That if all neceſſary points of ſimple belief be not comprized in the Creed, it can no way deſerve the name of the Apoſtles Creed, as not being their Creed in any ſenſe, but only a part of it.*

To

To this you ſay, *That the Faith of the Apoſtles is of larger extent, than their Creed.* Anſwer, It is very true that their whole Faith was of a larger extent, but that was not the Queſtion; but whether all points of ſimple belief which they taught as neceſſary to be explicitely believed, be not contained in it? And if thus much at leaſt of Chriſtian Religion be not comprized in it, I again deſire you to inform me how it could be called the Apoſtles Creed?

74. To other Reaſons grounded upon the practice of the Ancient Church; appointing her Infants to be inſtructed (for matters of ſimple belief,) only in the Creed: From her admitting Catechumens unto Baptiſm: and of Strangers unto her Communion, upon their only profeſſion of the Creed, you have not, that I perceive, thought fit to make any kind of anſwer.

75. Ad §. 26.] In this Section you practiſe that trick of a Caviller, which is to anſwer Objections by other Objections; an excellent way to make Controverſies endleſs! D. *Potter* deſires to be reſolved, *Why amongſt many things of equal neceſſity to be believed, the Apoſtles ſhould diſtinctly ſet down ſome in the Creed, and be altogether ſilent of others?* Inſtead of reſolving him in this difficulty, you put another to him, and that is, *Why are ſome points not Fundamental expreſſed in it, rather than others of the ſame quality?* Which demand is ſo far from ſatisfying the former doubt, that it makes it more intricate. For upon this ground it may be demanded, How was it poſſible that the Apoſtles ſhould leave out any Articles ſimply neceſſary, and put in others not neceſſary, eſpecially if their intention were (as you ſay it was) to deliver in it ſuch Articles as were fitteſt for thoſe times? Unleſs (which were wondrous ſtrange) unneceſſary Articles were fitter for thoſe times, than neceſſary. But now to your Queſtion, the Anſwer is obvious: Theſe unneceſſary things might be put in, becauſe they were circumſtances of the neceſſary, *Pontius Pilate* of Chriſts paſſion, The third day of the Reſurrection; neither doth the adding of them make the Creed ever a whit the leſs probable, the leſs fit

to

to be understood, and remembred. And for the contrary reasons, other unnecessary things might be left out. Besides, who sees not that the addition of some unnecessary circumstances is a thing that can hardly be avoided without affectation! And therefore not so great a fault, nor deserving such a censure, as the omission of any thing essential to the work undertaken, and necessary to the end proposed in it.

76. You demand again (as it is no hard matter to multiply demands,) *why our Saviours descent into Hell, and Burial was expressed, and not his circumcision, his manifestation to the three Kings, and working of Miracles?* I answer: His Resurrection, Ascension, and sitting at the right hand of God, are very great Miracles, and they are expressed. Besides, S. *John* assures us, *That the Miracles which Christ did, were done and written not for themselves that they might be believed,* but for a further end, that *we might believe that Jesus was the Christ, and believing have eternal life.* He therefore that believes this may be saved, though he have no explicite and distinct Faith of any Miracle that our Saviour did. His Circumcision and Manifestation to the Wise men (for I know not upon what grounds you call them *Kings*) are neither things simply necessary to be known, nor have any near relation to those that are so. As for his Descent into Hell, it may (for ought you know) be put in as a thing necessary of it self to be known. If you ask why more than his Circumcision, I refer you to the Apostles for an answer, who put that in, and left this out of their Creed: and yet sure, were not so *forgetful after the receiving of the Holy Ghost, as to leave out any prime and principal foundation of the faith,* which are the very words of your own *Gordonius Huntlæus, Cont.* 2. *c.* 10. *num.* 10. Likewise his Burial was put in perhaps as necessary of it self to be known. But though it were not, yet hath it manifestly so neer relation to these that are necessary, (his Passion and Resurrection, being the Consequent of the one, and the Antecedent of the other,) that it is no marvel if for their sakes it was put in. For though I verily believe that there is no necessary point of this nature, but

what is in the Creed, yet I do not affirm, becauſe I cannot prove it, that there is nothing in the Creed but what is neceſſary. You demand thirdly, *Why did they not expreſs Scriptures, Sacraments, and all Fundamental points of faith tending to practice, as well as thoſe which reſt in Belief?* I anſwer; Becauſe their purpoſe was to comprize in it only thoſe neceſſary points which reſt in belief: which appears, becauſe of practical points there is not in it ſo much as one.

77. We affirm, That if your Doctrin were true, this ſhort Creed, *viz. I believe the Roman Church to be Infallible*, would have been better, that is, more effectual to keep the believers of it from Hereſie, and in the true Faith, than this Creed which now we have. A propoſition ſo evident, that I cannot ſee how either you, or any of your Religion, or indeed any ſenſible man can from his heart deny it. Yet becauſe you make a ſhew of doing ſo, or elſe, which I rather hope, do not rightly apprehend the force of the Reaſon, I will endeavour briefly to add ſome light and ſtrength to it, by comparing the effects of theſe ſeveral ſuppoſed Creeds.

78. The former Creed therefore would certainly produce theſe effects in the believers of it: An impoſſibility of being in any formal Hereſie: A neceſſity of being prepared in mind to come out of all Error in Faith, or material Hereſie; which certainly you will not deny, or if you do, you pull down the only pillar of your Church and Religion, and deny that which is in effect the only thing you labour to prove through your whole Book.

79. The latter Creed which now we have, is ſo uneffectual for theſe good purpoſes, that you your ſelf tell us of innumerable, groſs, damnable Hereſies, that have been, are, and may be, whoſe contrary Truths are neither explicitly, nor by conſequence comprehended in this Creed: So that no man by the belief of this Creed without the former, can be poſſibly guarded from falling into them, and continuing obſtinate in them. Nay, ſo far is this Creed from guarding them from theſe miſchiefs, that it is more likely to enſnare them into them, by ſeeming and

yet

yet not being a full comprehension of all necessary points of Faith: which is apt (as experience shews,) to misguide men into this pernitious error, That believing the Creed, they believe all necessary points of faith, whereas indeed they do not so. Now upon these grounds I thus conclude: That Creed which hath great commodities and no danger, would certainly be better then that which hath great danger, and wants many of these great commodities; But the former short Creed proposed by me, *I believe the Roman Church to be Infallible,* (if your doctrin be true,) is of the former condition, and the latter, that is, the Apostles Creed, is of the latter, Therefore the former (if your doctrin be true) would without controversie be better than the latter.

83. Whereas you say, *If the Apostles had expresst no Article but that of the Catholick Church, she must have taught us the other Articles in particular by Creeds, or other means:* This is very true, but no way repugnant to the truth of this which follows, that the Apostles (if your doctrin be true) had done better service to the Church, though they had never made this Creed of theirs which now we have, if instead thereof, they had commanded in plain terms that for mens perpetual direction in the faith, this short Creed should be taught all men, *I believe the Roman Church shall be for ever Infallible.* Yet you must not so mistake me, as if I meant, that they had done better not to have taught the Church the substance of Christian Religion; for then the Church not having learnt it of them, could not have taught it us. This therefore I do not say: but supposing they had written these Scriptures as they have written, wherein all the Articles of their Creed are plainly delivered, and preached that Doctrin which they did preach, and done all other things as they have done, besides the composing their Symbol: I say, if your doctrin were true, they had done a work infinitely more beneficial to the Church of Christ, if they had never composed their Symbol, which is but an imperfect comprehension of the necessary points of simple belief, and no distinctive mark (as a Symbole should be) between those that are good Christians, and those that are not so; but

inſtead thereof, had delivered this one Propoſition, which would have been certainly effectual for all the aforeſaid good intents and purpoſes, *The Roman Church ſhall be forever Infallible in all things, which ſhe propoſes as matters of Faith.*

84. Whereas you ſay, *If we will believe we have all in the Creed, when we have not all, it is not the Apoſtles fault but our own:* I tell you plainly, if it be a fault, I know not whoſe it ſhould be but theirs. For ſure it can be no fault in me to follow ſuch Guides whether ſoever they lead me: Now I ſay, they have led me into this perſwaſion, becauſe they have given me great reaſon to believe it, and none to the contrary. The reaſon they have given me to believe it, is, becauſe it is apparent and confeſt, they did propoſe to themſelves in compoſing it, ſome good end or ends: As *that Chriſtians might have a form, by which* (for matter of Faith) *they might profeſs themſelves Catholicks, So* Putean *out of* Thomas Aquinas: *That the faithful might know, what the Chriſtian people is to believe explicitly, So* Vincent Filiucius: *That being ſeparated into divers parts of the world, they might preach the ſame thing: And that that might ſerve as a mark to diſtinguiſh true Chriſtians from Infidels, So Cardinal* Richlieu. Now for all theſe and for any other good intent, I ſay, it will be plainly uneffectual, unleſs it contain at leaſt all points of ſimple belief, which are in ordinary courſe, neceſſary to be explicitly known by all men. So that if it be a fault in me to believe this, it muſt be my fault to believe the Apoſtles, wiſe and good men: which I cannot do if I believe not this. And therefore what *Richardus de ſancto Victore* ſays of God himſelf, I make no ſcruple at all to apply to the Apoſtles, and to ſay, *Si error eſt quod credo, à vobis deceptus ſum:* If it be an Error which I believe, it is you, and my reverend eſteem of you and your actions that hath led me into it. For as for your ſuſpicion, *That we are led into this perſwaſion, out of a hope that we may the better maintain by it ſome opinions of our own,* It is plainly uncharitable. I know no opinion I have, which I would not as willingly forſake as keep, if I could ſee ſufficient reaſon to induce me to believe, that it is the will of God I

ſhould

ſhould forſake it. Neither do I know any opinion I hold againſt the Church of *Rome*, but I have more evident grounds than this whereupon to build it. For let but theſe Truths be granted: That the authority of the Scripture is independent on your Church, and dependent only in reſpect of us upon univerſal Tradition; That Scripture is the only Rule of Faith: That all things neceſſary to ſalvation are plainly delivered in Scripture: Let I ſay theſe moſt certain and divine Truths be laid for foundations, and let our ſuperſtructions be conſequent and coherent to them; and I am confident Peace would be reſtored, and Truth maintained againſt you, though the Apoſtles Creed were not in the world.

CHAP. V.

The ANSWER to the Fifth CHAPTER.

Shewing that the ſeparation of Proteſtants from the Roman-Church, being upon juſt and neceſſary cauſes, is not any way guilty of Schiſm.

1. AD §. 1.2,3,4,5,6,7. In the ſeven firſt Sections of this Chapter, there be many things ſaid and many things ſuppoſed by you which are untrue, and deſerve a cenſure. As

2. Firſt, *That Schiſm could not be a Diviſion from the Church, or that a Diviſion from the Church could not happen, unleſs there always had been and ſhould be a viſible Church.* Which Aſſertion is a manifeſt falſehood: For although there never had been any Church Viſible or Inviſible before this age, nor ſhould be ever after, yet this could not hinder, but that a Schiſm might now be, and be a Diviſion from the preſent Viſible Church. As though in *France* there never had been until now a lawful Monarch, nor after him ever ſhould be, yet this hinders not, but that now there might be a Rebellion, and that Rebellion might be an Inſurrection againſt Sovereign Authority.

3. *That*

3. *That it is a point to be granted by all Chriſtians, that in all ages there hath been a viſible Congregation of faithful people.* Which Propoſition howſoever you underſtand it, is not abſolutely certain. But if you mean by *Faithful,* (as it is plain you do) *free from all error in faith,* then you know all Proteſtants with one conſent affirm it to be falſe; and therefore without proof to take it for granted is to beg the Queſtion.

4. *That ſuppoſing* Luther *and they which did firſt ſeparate from the Roman Church were guilty of Schiſm, it is certainly conſequent, that all who perſiſt in this diviſion muſt be ſo likewiſe.* Which is not ſo certain as you pretend. For they which alter without neceſſary cauſe the preſent government of any ſtate Civil or Eccleſiaſtical, do commit a great fault; whereof notwithſtanding they may be innocent who continue this alteration, and to the utmoſt of their power oppoſe a change though to the former ſtate, when continuance of time hath once ſetled the preſent. Thus have I known ſome of your own Church condemn the Low-country-men who firſt revolted from the King of *Spain,* of the ſin of Rebellion, yet abſolve them from it who now being of your Religion there, are yet faithful maintainers of the common liberty againſt the pretences of the King of *Spain.*

5. *That all thoſe which a Chriſtian is to eſteem neighbors do concur to make one company, which is the Church.* Which is falſe: for a Chriſtian is to eſteem thoſe his neighbors, who are not members of the true Church.

6. *That all the members of the Viſible Church, are by charity united into one Myſtical body.* Which is manifeſtly untrue; for many of them have no Charity.

7. *That the Catholick Church, ſignifies one company of faithful people,* which is repugnant to your own grounds. For you require not true faith, but only the Profeſſion of it, to make men members of the Viſible Church.

8. *That every Heretick is a Schiſmatick.* Which you muſt acknowledge falſe in thoſe, who though they deny, or doubt of ſome point profeſſed by your Church, and ſo are Hereticks: yet continue ſtill in the Communion of the Church.

9. *That*

9. *That all the members of the Catholick Church, must of necessity be united in external Communion.* Which though it were much to be desired it were so, yet certainly cannot be perpetually true. For a man unjustly excommunicated, is not in the Churches Communion, yet he is still a member of the Church: and divers times it hath happened, as in the case of *Chrisostom* and *Epiphanius*, that particular men, and particular Churches, have upon an overvalued difference, either renounced Communion mutually, or one of them separated from the other, and yet both have continued members of the Catholick Church. These things are in those *seven Sections*, either said or supposed by you untruly, without all shew, or pretence of proof. The rest is an impertinent common place, wherein Protestants and the cause in hand, are absolutely unconcerned. And therefore I pass to the *eighth Section.*

10. Ad §. 8.] Here you obtrude upon us, a double fallacy; One, in supposing and taking for granted, that whatsoever is affirmed by *three Fathers*, must be true; whereas your selves make no scruple of condemning many things of falsehood, which yet are maintained, by more than thrice three Fathers. Another, in pretending their words to be spoken absolutely, which by them are limited and restrained to some particular cases. Thus the words of S. *Austin* (cap. 11. lib. 2. *cont. Parm.*) *That there is no necessity to divide Unity*; are not spoken absolutely, that there never is, nor can be any necessity to divide Unity (which only were for your purpose) but only in such a special case as he there sets down: That is, *When good men tolerate bad men, which can do them no spiritual hurt, to the intent they may not be separated from those, who are spiritually good: Then* (saith he) *there is no necessity to divide Unity.* Which very words do clearly give us to understand, that it may fall out (as it doth in our case) that we cannot keep Unity with bad men, without spiritual hurt, *i. e.* without partaking with them in their impieties, and that then there is a necessity to divide Unity from them: I mean, to break off conjunction with them in their impieties. Which that it was S. *Austins* mind, it is most evident out of the 21. c. of the

the same book: where to *Parmenian* demanding, *how can a man remain pure, being joyned with those that are corrupted?* He answers, *Very true, this is not possible, if he be joyned with them, that is, if he commit any evil with them, or favour them which do commit it. But if he do neither of these, he is not joyned with them.* And presently after, *these two things retained, will keep such men pure and uncorrupted; that is, neither doing ill, nor approving it.* And therefore seeing you impose upon all men of your Communion, a necessity of *doing* or at least *approving* many things unlawful, certainly there lies upon us an unavoidable necessity of dividing Unity, either with you, or with God; and whether of these is rather to be done, be ye judges.

11. *Iræneus* also says not simply (which only would do you service, (there cannot possibly be any so important Reformation, as to justifie a Separation from them who will not reform: But only, *they cannot make any corruption so great, as is the pernitiousness of a Schism:* Now, *They,* here is a relative, and hath an antecedent expressed in *Iræneus,* which if you had been pleased to take notice of, you would easily have seen, that what *Irenæus* says, falls heavy upon the Church of *Rome,* but toucheth Protestants nothing at all. For the men he speaks of, are such as *Propter modicas & quaslibet causas, for trifling or small causes, divide the body of Christ; such as speak of peace and make war; such as strain at Gnats, and swallow Camels. And these* saith he, *can make no reformation of any such importance, as to countervail the danger of a division.* Now seeing the causes of our separation from the Church of *Rome,* are (as we pretend, and are ready to justify,) because we will not be partakers with her in Superstition, Idolatry, Impiety, and most cruel Tyranny, both upon the bodies and souls of men. Who can say, that the causes of our separation, may be justly esteemed *Modicæ & quælibet causæ?* On the other side, seeing the Bishop of *Rome,* who was contemporary to *Irenæus,* did as much (as in him lay) cut off from the Churches unity, many great Churches, for not conforming to him in an indifferent matter, upon a difference, *Non de Catholico dogmate, sed de Ritu, vel Ritus potius tempore, not about any Catholick Doctrin, but*

but only a Ceremony, or rather about the time of observing it; so *Petavius* values it: which was just all one, as if the Church of *France* should excommunicate those of their own Religion in *England*, for not keeping *Christmas* upon the same day with them: And seeing he was reprehended sharply and bitterly for it, by most of the Bishops of the World, as * *Eusebius* testifies, and (as Cardinal *Perron* though mincing the matter, yet confesseth) by this very *Irenæus* himself in particular admonished, that for so small a cause (*propter tam modicam causam,*) he should not have cut off so many Provinces from the Body of the Church: and lastly, seeing the Ecclesiastical story of those times, mentions no other notable example of any such Schismatical presumption, but this of *Victor*: certainly we have great inducement to imagin, that *Irenæus* in this place by you quoted, had a special aim at the Bishop and Church of *Rome*. Once, this I am sure of, that the place fits him, and many of his successors, as well as if it had been made purposely for them. And this also, that he which finds fault with them *who separate upon small causes*, implies clearly, that he conceived, their might be such causes as were great and sufficient: And that then a Reformation was to be made, notwithstanding any danger of division that might insue upon it.

* *Euseb. hist. l.* 5 *c.* 24. *Perron. Replic. l.* 3. *c.* 2.

12. Lastly, S. *Denis* of *Alexandria*, says indeed and very well, *that all things should be rather indured, than we should consent to the division of the Church*: I would add, Rather than consent to the continuation of the division, if it might be remedied. But then, I am to tell you, that he says not All things should rather *be done*, but only, All things should rather *be indured or suffered*: wherein he speaks not of the evil of Sin, but of Pain and Misery: Not of tolerating either Error or Sin in others (though that may be lawful,) much less of joyning with others for quietness sake, (which only were to your purpose) in the profession of Error and practice of sin: but of suffering any affliction, nay even Martyrdom in our own persons, rather than consent to the division of the Church. *Omnia incommoda*, so your own *Christophorson*, enforced by

the circumſtances of the place, tranſlates *Dionyſius* his words, All *miſeries ſhould rather be endured, then we ſhould conſent to the Churches diviſion.*

13. Ad §. 9.] In this Paragraph you tell us firſt, *that the Doctrine of the total deficiency of the viſible Church, maintained by many chief* Proteſtants *implies in it vaſt abſurdity, or rather ſacrilegious Blaſphemy.*

Anſw. But neither do the *Proteſtants* alledged by you, maintain the deficiency of the Viſible Church, but only of the Churches Viſibility, or of the Church as it is viſible; neither do they hold that the Viſible Church hath failed totally from its eſſence, but only from its purity; and that it fell into many corruptions, but yet not to nothing. You ſay ſecondly, *that the Reaſon which caſt them upon this wicked Doctrine, was a deſperate voluntary neceſſity, becauſe they were reſolved not to acknowledge the* Roman *to be the true Church, and were convinced by all manner of evidence, that for diverſe Ages before* Luther *there was no other.* But this is not to diſpute but to Divine, and take upon you the property of God which is to know the Hearts of Men. For why I pray, might not the Reaſon hereof rather be, becauſe they were convinced by all manner of evidence, as Scripture, Reaſon, Antiquity, that all the Viſible Churches in the World, but above all the *Roman*, had degenerated from the purity of the Goſpel of Chriſt, and thereupon did conclude there was no Viſible Church, meaning by *no Church, none free from corruption*, and conformable in all things to the Doctrine of Chriſt.

14. Ad §. 10. Neither is there any repugnance (but in words only) between theſe (as you are pleaſed to ſtile them) *exterminating Spirits*, and thoſe other, whom out of courteſie you intitle, in your 10. §. *more moderate Proteſtants.* For theſe affirming the Perpetual Viſibility of the Church, yet neither deny, nor doubt of her being ſubject to manifold and grievous corruptions, and thoſe of ſuch a nature, as were they not mitigated by invincible, or at leaſt a very probable ignorance, none ſubject to them could be ſaved. And they on the other ſide, denying the Churches Viſibility

Visibility, yet plainly affirm, that they conceive very good hope of the Salvation of many, of their ignorant and honest Fore-fathers. Thus declaring plainly, though in words they denied the Visibility of the true Church, yet their meaning was not to deny the perpetuity, but the perpetual purity and incorruption of the Visible Church.

17. Ad §. 11.] You ask, *To what Congregation shall a man have recourse for the affairs of his Soul; if upon Earth there be no visible Church of Christ?*

Answ. If some one Christian lived alone among *Pagans* in some Country, remote from Christendom, shall we conceive it impossible for this man to be saved, because he cannot have recourse to any Congregation for the affairs of his Soul? Will it not be sufficient, for such a ones Salvation, to know the Doctrine of Christ, and live according to it?

18. *Obj.* To *imagine a company of Men believing one thing in their Heart, and with their Mouth professing the contrary (as they must be supposed to do, for if they had professed what they believed, they would have become visible) is to dream of a damned crew of dissembling Sycophants, but not to conceive aright of the Church of Christ.* Answ. What is this to the Visibility of the Church? May not the Church be Invisible, and yet these that are of it profess their Faith? No, say you: Their profession will make them visible. Very true, visible in the places where, and in the times when they live, and to those persons, unto whom they have necessary occasion, to make their profession: But not visible to all, or any great, or considerable part of the World while they live, much less conspicuous to all Ages after them. Now it is a Church thus illustriously and conspicuously visible that you require: by whose splendour, all men may be directed and drawn to repair to her, for the affairs of their Souls: Neither is it the Visibility of the Church absolutely, but this degree of it, which the most rigid Protestants deny: which is plain enough out of the places of *Napper*, cited by you in your 9. Part. of this chapt. Where his words are, *God hath withdrawn his visible Church from open Assemblies, to the Hearts of par-*

ticular godly men. And this Church which had not open Aſſemblies, he calls *The latent and Inviſible Church.* Now I hope *Papiſts* in *England* will be very apt to grant, men may be ſo far Latent and Inviſible, as not to profeſs their Faith in open Aſſemblies, nor to proclaim it to all the World, and yet not deny, nor diſſemble it; nor deſerve to be eſteemed a *damned crew of diſſembling Sycophants.*

Obj. *But Preaching of the Word, and adminiſtration of the Sacraments, cannot but make a Church Viſible: and theſe are inſeparable Notes of the Church.* I anſwer, they are ſo far inſeparable, that whereſoever they are, there a Church is: But not ſo, but that in ſome caſes there may be a Church, where theſe Notes are not. Again, theſe Notes will make the Church viſible: But to whom? certainly not to all men, nor to moſt men: But to them only to whom the Word is Preached, and the Sacraments are adminiſtred. They make the Church Viſible to whom themſelves are viſible, but not to others. As where your Sacraments are adminiſtred, and your Doctrine Preached, it is viſible, that there is a Popiſh Church. But this may perhaps be viſible to them only, who are preſent at theſe performances, and to others, as ſecret, as if they had never been performed.

20. Obj. *But S.* Auſtin *ſaith, it is an impudent, abominable, deteſtible ſpeech,* &c. *to ſay the Church hath Periſhed.* Anſw. 1. All that S. *Auſtin* ſays is not true. 2. Though this were true, it were nothing to your purpoſe, unleſs you will conceive it all one not to be, and not to be conſpicuouſly viſible. 3. This very ſpeech that the Church Periſhed, might be falſe and impudent in the *Donatiſts,* and yet not ſo in the Proteſtants. For there is no incongruity, that what hath lived 500. Years, may periſh in 1600.

21. Obj. *While Proteſtants deny the perpetuity of a viſible Church, they deſtroy their own preſent Church.* Anſw. I do not ſee, how the Truth of any preſent Church depends upon the perpetual Viſibility, nay nor upon the perpetuity of that which is paſt or future. For what ſenſe is there, that it ſhould not be in the power of God Almighty, to reſtore to a flouriſhing Eſtate, a Church which oppreſ-

ſion

sion hath made Invisible? to repair that which is ruined; to reform that which was corrupted, or to revive that which was dead? Nay what reason is there, but that by ordinary means this may be done, so long as the Scriptures by Divine Providence are preserved in their integrity and Authority? As a Common-wealth though never so far collapsed and overrun with disorders, is yet in possibility of being reduced unto its Original State, so long as the Ancient Laws, and Fundamental Constitutions are extant, and remain inviolate, from whence men may be directed how to make such a Reformation. *But S.* Austin *urges this very Argument against the* Donatists, *and therefore it is good.* I answer, that I doubt much of the Consequence, and my Reason is, because you your selves acknowledge, that even general Councils (and therefore much more particular Doctors) though Infallible in their determinations, are yet in their Reasons and Arguments, whereupon they ground them, subject to like Passions and Errors with other men.

22. *Obj.* Lastly whereas you say, *That all Divines define Schism a Division from the true Church,* and from thence collect, That *there must be a known Church from which it is possible for men to depart.* Answer, I might very justly question your Antecedent, and desire you to consider, whether Schism be not rather, or at least be not as well a division of the Church, as from it? A separation not of a part from the whole, but of some parts from the other. And if you liked not this definition, I might desire you to inform me in those many Schisms, which have happened in the Church of *Rome,* which of the parts was the Church, and which was divided from it. But to let this pass, certainly your consequence is most unreasonable. For though whensoever there is a Schism, it must necessarily suppose a Church existent there, yet sure we may define a Schism, that is, declare what the word signifies (for Defining is no more) though at this present there were neither Schism nor Church in the World. Unless you will say, that we cannot tell wat a Rose is, or what the word Rose signifies, but only in the Summer when we have Roses: or

that

that in the World to come, when men ſhall not Marry, it is impoſſible to know, what it is to Marry : or that the Plague is not a Diſeaſe, but only when ſome Body is infected : or that Adultery is not a ſin, unleſs there be Adulterers : or that before *Adam* had a Child, he knew not, and God could not have told him, what it was to be a Father. Certainly Sir, you have forgot your Metaphyſicks, which you ſo much glory in, if you know not, that the connexions of eſſentiall predicates with their ſubjects, are Eternal, and depend not at all upon the actual exiſtence in the thing defined. This Definition therefore of Schiſm, concludes not the exiſtence of a Church, even when it is defined : much leſs the perpetual continuance of it, and leaſt of all the continuance of it in perpetual viſibility and purity, which is the only thing that we deny, and you are to prove.

23. Ad §. 12. 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55. The remainder of this Chapter, offers Arguments to convince *Luther* and all that follow him to be Schiſmaticks.

24. Firſt then to prove us Schiſmaticks, you urge from the nature of Schiſm thus.

Whoſoever leave the external Communion of the viſible Church, are Schiſmaticks : But Luther *and his followers left the external Communion of the viſible Church of Chriſt : Therefore they are Schiſmaticks.*

The Minor or ſecond Propoſition of this Argument, you prove by two other. The firſt is this.

They which forſook the external Communion of all Viſible Churches, muſt needs forſake the external Communion of the true viſible Church of Chriſt. But Luther *and his followers forſook the external Communion of all Viſible Churches : Therefore they forſook the external Communion of the true viſible Church.*

The Second Argument ſtands thus.

The Roman *Church, when the ſeparation was made by* Luther, *&c. was the true Viſible Church of Chriſt.*

But Luther, *&c. forſook the external Communion of the* Roman *Church. Therefore they forſook the external Communion of the true Viſible Church of Chriſt.*

The

The Proposition you confirm by these Reasons.

1. *The* Roman *Church had the Notes of the Church assigned by* Protestants, *viz. The true Preaching of the Word, and due administration of Sacraments: Therefore she was the true Church.*

2. *Either the* Roman *Church was the true visible Church, or* Protestants *can name and prove some other disagreeing from the* Roman, *and agreeing with* Protestants, *in their particular Doctrine: or else they must say there was no visible Church: But they will not say, there was no Church: They cannot name and prove any other disagreeing from the* Roman, *and agreeing with the* Protestants *in their particular Doctrines; because this cannot be the* Greek *Church, nor that of the* Waldenses, Wicklifites, Hussites, *nor that of the* Muscovites, Armenians, Georgians, Æthiopians, *(which you confirm by several Arguments:) Therefore they must grant, that the* Roman *Church was the true Visible Church.*

25. Now to all this I briefly answer thus: That you have played the unwise builder, and erected a stately structure upon a false Foundation. For whereas you take for granted as an undoubted Truth, *That whosoever leave the external Communion of the visible Church, are Schismatical,* I tell you Sir, you presume too much upon us, and would have us grant, that which is the main point in Question. For either you suppose the external Communion of the Church corrupted, and that there was a necessity for them, that would Communicate with this Church, to Communicate in her corruptions: Or you suppose her Communion uncorrupted. If the former, and yet will take for granted, that all are Schismaticks, that leave her Communion though it be corrupted, you beg the Question in your proposition. If the latter, you beg the Question in your supposition, for *Protestants,* you know, are Peremptory and Unanimous in the Denial of both these things: Both that the Communion of the Visible Church, was then uncorrupted; And that they are truly Schismaticks, who leave the Commumion of the Visible Church, if corrupted; especially, if the case be so (and *Luthers* was so) that they must either leave her Communion

or

or of neceſſity Communicate with her in her corruptions.

26. Beſides although it were granted Schiſm, to leave the external Communion of the Viſible Church in what ſtate or caſe ſo ever it be, and that *Luther* and his followers were Schiſmaticks, for leaving the external Communion of all Viſible Churches: yet you fail exceedingly of clearing the other neceſſary point undertaken by you, *That the Roman Church was then the Viſible Church.* For neither do *Proteſtants* (as you miſtake) *make the true preaching of the Word, and due adminiſtration of the Sacraments, the notes of the Viſible Church,* but only of a Viſible Church: now theſe you know are very different things, the former ſignifying *the Church Catholick,* or the whole Church: the latter a *Particular Church,* or a part of the Catholick. And therefore ſuppoſe out of courteſie, we ſhould grant, what by argument you can never evince, that your Church had theſe notes, yet would it by no means follow, that your Church were *the Viſible Church,* but only *a Viſible Church:* not the whole Catholick, but only a part of it.

27. Laſtly, whereas *you ſay, that* Proteſtants *muſt either grant that your Church then was the Viſible Church, or name ſome other, diſagreeing from yours and agreeing with* Proteſtants *in their particular doctrin, or acknowledge there was no Viſible Church.* It is all one as if (to uſe S. *Pauls* ſimilitude) the head ſhould ſay to the foot, either you muſt grant that I am the whole body, or name ſome other member that is ſo, or confeſs that there is no body. To which the foot might anſwer; I acknowledge there is a body: and yet, that no member beſide you is this body: nor yet that you are it, but only a part of it. And in like manner ſay we. We acknowledge a Church there was, corrupted indeed univerſally, but yet ſuch a one as we hope by Gods gracious acceptance, was ſtill a Church. We pretend not to name any one Society that was this Church, and yet we ſee no reaſon, that can enforce us to confeſs that yours was the Church but only a part of it, and that one of the worſt then extant in the World. In vain therefore have you troubled your ſelf in proving, that we *cannot pretend, that either the Greeks, Waldenſes, Wickliffites, Huſſites, Muſcovites, Armenians, Georgians,*

Georgians, Abyssines, were then the Visible Church. For all this discourse proceeds from a false & vain supposition, and begs another point in Question between us, which is, that *some Church of one denomination and one Communion* (as the *Roman*, the *Greek*, &c.) *must be always*, exclusively to all other Communions, *the whole Visible Church.* And though perhaps some weak *Protestant* having this false principle setled in him, that there was to be always some Visible Church of one denomination, pure from all error in doctrin, might be wrought upon, and prevailed with by it, to forsake the Church of *Protestants*: yet why it should induce him to go to yours, rather than the *Greek* Church, or any other, which pretends to perpetual succession as well as yours, that I do not understand; unless it be for the reason which *Æneas Sylvius* gave, why more held the Pope above a Council, than a Council above the Pope: which was because *Popes did give Bishopricks, and Archbishopricks, but Councils gave none*, and therefore suing in *Forma Pauperis*,, were not like to have their cause very well maintained. For put the case, I should grant of meer favour, that there must be always some Church of one Denomination and Communion, free from all errors in doctrin, and that Protestants had not always such a Church: it would follow indeed from thence, that I must not be a Protestant: But that I must be a Papist, certainly it would follow by no better consequence than this; if you will leave *England*, you must of necessity go to *Rome*. And yet with this wretched fallacy, have I been sometimes abused my self, and known many other poor souls seduced, not only from their own Church and Religion, but unto yours. I beseech God to open the eyes of all that love the truth, that they may not always be held captive, under such miserable delusions.

28. Let us come now to the Arguments which you build upon D. *Potters* own words, out of which you promise unanswerable reasons to convince Protestants of Schism.

29. But these reasons will easily be answered, if the Reader will take along with him these three short Memorandums.

30. Firſt, That not every ſeparation, but only a cauſeleſs ſeparation from the external Communion of any Church, is the Sin of Schiſm.

31. Secondly, That impoſing upon men under pain of Excommunication a neceſſity of profeſſing known errors, and practiſing known corruptions, is a ſufficient and neceſſary cauſe of ſeparation, and that this is the cauſe the Proteſtants alledge to juſtifie their ſeparation from which Church of *Rome*.

32. Thirdly, That to leave the Church, and to leave the external Communion of a Church, is not the ſame thing: That being done by ceaſing to be a member of it, by ceaſing to have thoſe requiſites which conſtitute a man a member of it, as faith and obedience: This by refuſing to communicate with any Church in her Liturgies and publick worſhip of God. This Armour if it be rightly placed, will repel all thoſe Batteries which you threaten us with all.

33. Ad §. 13. 14, 15.] The firſt is a ſentence of S. *Auſtin* againſt *Donatus*, applied to *Luther* thus. *If the Church periſhed, what Church brought forth* Donatus, *(you ſay* Luther?) *If ſhe could not periſh, what madneſs moved the ſect of* Donatus *to ſeparate, upon pretence to avoid the Communion of bad men?* Whereunto, one fair anſwer (to let paſs many others) is obvious out of the ſecond obſervation: That this ſentence though it were Goſpel, as it is not, is impertinently applied to *Luther* and *Lutherans*. Whoſe pretence of ſeparation (be it true or be it falſe, was not (as that of the *Donatiſts*,) only to avoid the Communion of bad men: but to free themſelves from a neceſſity (which but by ſeparating was unavoidable,) of joyning with bad men in their impieties.

34. Ad §. 16. Your ſecond onſet drives only at thoſe *Proteſtants*, who *hold the true Church was inviſible for many ages*. Which Doctrin (if by the *true Church* be underſtood, the *pure Church*, as you do underſtand it) is a certain truth, & it is eaſier for you to declaim (as you do) than to diſpute againſt it. But *theſe men you ſay muſt be Hereticks becauſe they ſeparated from the Communion of the Viſible Church: and there-*

therefore also from the Communion of that which they say was invisible: In as much as the invisible Church communicated with the visible.

35. *Ans.* I might very justly desire some proof of that which so confidently you take for granted: That, there were no persecuted and oppressed maintainers of the Truth in the days of our Fore-fathers, but only such as dissembled their opinions, and lived in your Communion. And truly if I should say there were many of this condition, I suppose I could make my Affirmative much more probable, than you can make your Negative. We read in Scripture, that *Elias* conceived *there was none left besides himself in the whole Kingdom of Israel,* who had not revolted from God: and yet God himself assures us that he was deceived. And if such a man, a Prophet, and one of the greatest, erred in his judgment touching his own time, and his own Country, why may not you, who are certainly but a man, and subject to the same passions as *Elias* was, mistake in thinking, that in former ages, in some Countrey or other, there were not always some good Christians, which did not so much as externally bow their knees to your *Baal*? But this answer I am content you shall take no notice of, and think it sufficient to tell you, that if it be true, that this supposed invisible Church did hypocritically communicate with the visible Church, in her corruptions, then *Protestants* had cause, nay necessity, to forsake their Communion also, for otherwise they must have joyned with them in the practice of impieties: and seeing they had such cause to separate, they presume their separation cannot be Schismatical.

36. Yes, you reply, *to forsake the external Communion of them with whom they agree in faith, is the most formal and proper sin of Schism. Answ.* Very true, but I would fain know *wherein.* I would gladly be informed, whether I be bound for fear of Schism, to communicate with those that believe as I do, only in lawful things, or absolutely in every thing; whether I am to joyn with them in Superstition and Idolatry, and not only in a common profession of the Faith wherein we agree, but in a common dissimula-

tion or abjuration of it. This is that which you would have them do, or elſe, forſooth, they muſt be Schiſmaticks. But hereafter I pray remember, that there is no neceſſity of communicating even with true Believers in wicked actions. Nay that there is a neceſſity herein to ſeparate from them. And then I dare ſay, even you being their judge, the reaſonableneſs of their cauſe to ſeparate ſhall, according to my firſt obſervation, juſtifie their ſeparation from being Schiſmatical.

37. Arg. *But the property of Schiſm according to D.* Potter *is to cut off from the hope of ſalvation, the Church from which it ſeparates: And theſe Proteſtants have this property, therefore they are Schiſmaticks.*

38. *Anſ.* I deny the Syllogiſm, it is no better than this: One Smptom of the Plague is a Feaver, but ſuch a man hath a Feaver, therefore he hath the Plague. The true concluſion which iſſues out of theſe Premiſſes, ſhould be this. Therefore he hath one Symptom of the plague. And ſo likewiſe in the former, therefore they have one property or one quality of Schiſmaticks. And as in the former inſtance, The man that hath one ſign of the plague, may by reaſon of the abſence of other requiſites, not have the plague: So theſe Proteſtants may have ſomething of Schiſmaticks, and yet not be Schiſmaticks. A Tyrant ſentencing a man to death for his pleaſure, and a juſt judge that condemns a malefactor, do both ſentence a man to death, and ſo for the matter do both the ſame thing: yet the one does wickedly, the other juſtly. What's the reaſon? becauſe the one hath cauſe, the other hath not. In like manner Schiſmaticks, either always or generally denounce damnation to them from whom they ſeparate. The ſame do theſe Proteſtants, & yet are not Schiſmaticks. The Reaſon: becauſe Schiſmaticks do it, and do it without cauſe, and Proteſtants have cauſe for what they do. The impieties of your Church, being, generally ſpeaking, damnable, unleſs where they are excuſed by ignorance, and expiated at leaſt by a general repentance. In fine, though perhaps it may be true, that all Schiſmaticks do ſo: yet univerſal affirmatives are not converted, and therefore it follows

follows not by any good Logick, that all that do so, when there is just cause for it, must be Schismaticks. The cause in this matter of separation is all in all, and that for ought I see, you never think of. But *if these rigid Protestants have just cause to cut off your Church from the hope of salvation: How can the milder sort allow hope of salvation to the Members of this Church? Ans.* Distinguish the quality of the Persons censured, and this seeming repugnance of their censures will vanish into nothing. For your Church may be considered either in regard of those, in whom, either negligence, or pride, or worldly fear, or hopes, or some other voluntary sin, is the cause of their ignorance, which I fear is the case of the generality of men amongst you: or in regard of those who owe their Errors from Truth, to want of capacity, or default of instruction; either in respect of those that might know the truth and will not, or of those who would know the truth but (all things considered) cannot: In respect of those that have eyes to see, and will not see, or those that would gladly see, but want eyes, or light. Consider the former sort of men, (which your more rigid censures seem especially to reflect upon,) and the heaviest sentence will not be too heavy. Consider the latter, and the mildest will not be too mild. So that here is no difference but in words only, neither are you flattered by the one, nor uncharitably censured by the other.

39. Your next blow is directed against the milder sort of Protestants, *who you say involve themselves in the sin of Schism by communicating with those (as you call them) exterminating Spirits, whom you conceive your self to have proved Schismaticks:* And now load them further with the crime of Heresie. For, say you, *if you held your selves obliged under pain of damnation, to forsake the Communion of the* Roman *Church by reason of her Errors, which yet you confess were not fundamental: shall it not be much more damnable, to live in confraternity with these, who defend an Error of the failing of the Church, which in the* Donatists *you confess to have been properly Heretical?*

40. *Ans.* You mistake in thinking that Protestants hold themselves obliged not to communicate with you, only or prin-

principally by reaſon of your Errors and Corruption. For the true reaſon according to my third obſervation, is not ſo much becauſe you *maintain* Errors and Corruptions, as becauſe you *impoſe* them: and will allow your Communion to none but to thoſe that will hold them with you; and have ſo ordered your Communion, that either we muſt communicate with you in theſe things, or nothing. And for this very reaſon, though it were granted, that theſe Proteſtants held this Doctrin which you impute to them; And though this Error were as damnable and as much againſt the Creed as you pretend: Yet after all this, this diſparity between you and them, might make it more lawful for us to communicate with them than you: becauſe what they hold, they hold to themſelves, and refuſe not (as you do) to communicate with them that hold the contrary.

41. Thus we may anſwer your Argument, though both your former Suppoſitions were granted, But then for a ſecond anſwer, I am to tell you that there is no neceſſity of granting either of them. For neither do theſe Proteſtants hold the failing of the Church from its being, but only from its viſibility: which if you conceive all one, then muſt you conceive that the Stars fail every day, and the Sun every night. Neither is it certain that the Doctrin of the Churches failing is repugnant to the Creed. For as the truth of the Article of the Remiſſion of ſins, depends not upon the actual remiſſion of any mans ſins, but upon Gods readineſs and reſolution to forgive the ſins of all that believe and repent; ſo that, although unbelief or impenitence ſhould be univerſal, and *the Faithful ſhould* abſolutely *fail from the children of men,* and *the ſon of man ſhould find no faith on the earth,* yet ſhould the Article ſtill continue true, that God would forgive the ſins of all that repent: In like manner, it is not certain that the truth of the Article of the Catholick Church depends upon the actual exiſtence of a Catholick Church, but rather upon the right, that the Church of Chriſt, or rather (to ſpeak properly) the Goſpel of Chriſt hath to be univerſally believed. And therefore the Article may be true, though there

there were no Church in the world. In regard, this notwithstanding, it remains still true that there ought to be a Church, and this Church ought to be Catholick. For as, of these two Propositions, There is a Church in *America*, and, There should be a Church in *America*, The truth of the latter depends not upon the truth of the former, so neither does it in these two: There is a Church diffused all the world over, and, There should be a Church diffused all the world over.

44. Ad §. 17. The next Section in three long leaves delivers us this short sense. *That those Protestants which say they have not left the Churches external Communion, but only her corruptions pretend to do that which is impossible. Because these corruptions were inherent in the Churches external Communion: and therefore he that forsakes them cannot but forsake this.*

45. *Ans.* But who are they that pretend, they forsook the Churches corruptions, and not her external communion? Some there be that say, they have not left the Church, that is, not ceased to be members of the Church, but only left her corruptions: some, that they have not left the communion, but the corruptions of it; meaning the internal communion of it, and conjunction with it by faith and obedience: which disagree from the former only in the manner of speaking: for he that is in the Church, is in this kind of communion with it: and he that is not in this internal communion, is not in the Church. Some perhaps, that they left not your external communion in all things; meaning, that they left it not voluntarily being not *fugitivi* but *fugati*, as being willing to joyn with you in any act of piety; but were by you necessitated & constrained to do so, because you would not suffer them to do well with you, unless they would do ill with you. Now to do ill that you may do well, is against the will of God, which to every good man is a high degree of necessity. But for such Protestants, as pretend that *de facto, they forsook your corruptions only and not your external communion*, that is, such as pretend to communicate with you in your Confessions and Liturgies, and participation of Sacraments, I cannot but

Casaubon in Ep. ad Card. Perron.

but doubt very much, that neither you nor I have ever met with any of this condition. And if perhaps you were led into error, by thinking that to leave the Church, and to leave the external communion of it, was all one in ſenſe and ſignification, I hope by this time you are diſabuſed, and begin to underſtand, that as a man may leave any faſhion or cuſtom of a Colledge, and yet remain ſtill a member of the Colledge; ſo a man may poſſibly leave ſome opinion or practice of a Church formerly common to himſelf and others, and continue ſtill a member of that Church: Provided that what he forſakes be not one of thoſe things wherein the eſſence of the Church conſiſts. Whereas peradventure this practice may be ſo involved with the external communion of this Church, that it may be ſimply impoſſible, for him to leave this practice, and not to leave the Churches external communion.

46. You will reply perhaps, *That the difficulty lies as well againſt thoſe who pretend to forſake the Churches corruptions and not the Church: as againſt thoſe who ſay, they forſook the Churches corruptions, and not her external communion. And that the reaſon is ſtill the ſame: becauſe theſe ſuppoſed corruptions, were inherent in the whole Church, and therefore by like reaſon with the former, could not be forſaken, but if the whole Church were forſaken.*

47. *Anſ.* A pretty Sophiſm, and very fit to perſwade men that it is impoſſible for them, to forſake any Error they hold, or any Vice they are ſubject to, either peculiar to themſelves, or in common with others: Becauſe forſooth, they cannot forſake themſelves, and Vices and Errors are things inherent in themſelves. The deceit lies, in not diſtinguiſhing between a Local and a Moral forſaking of any thing. For as it were an abſurdity, fit for the maintainers of Tranſubſtantiation to defend, that a man may locally and properly depart from the accidents of a ſubject, and not from the ſubject it ſelf: So is it alſo againſt reaſon to deny, that a man may (by an uſual phraſe of ſpeech) forſake any cuſtom, or quality, good or bad, either proper to himſelf, or common to himſelf with any company, and yet never truly or properly forſake either his company or himſelf.

himself. Thus if all the Jesuites in the Society, were given to write Sophistically, yet you might leave this ill custome, and yet not leave your Society. If all the Citizens of a City, were addicted to any vanity, they might either, all, or some of them forsake it, and yet not forsake the City. If all the parts of a mans Body were dirty or filthy, nothing hinders but that all or some of them might cleanse themselves, and yet continue parts of the Body. And what reason then in the World is there, if the whole visible Church were overcome with Tares and Weeds of superstitions; and corruptions, but that some members of it might reform themselves, and yet continue still true members of the Body of the Church, and not be made no members, but the better by their Reformation?

50. We acknowledge, that we cannot (as matters now stand) *Separate from your corruptions, but we must depart from your External Communion.* For you have so ordered things, that whosoever will Communicate with you at all, must Communicate with you, in your corruptions. But it is you that will not perceive the difference, between, being a part of the Church, and being in external Communion with all the other parts of it: taking for granted, that which is certainly false, that no two men or Churches, divided in external Communion, can be both true parts of the Catholick Church.

51. We are not *to learn the difference between* Schism *and* Heresie, for *Heresie* we conceive, an obstinate defence of any Error, against any necessary Article of the Christian Faith: And *Schism*, a causeless separation of one part of the Church from another. But this we say, That if we convince you of Errors and corruptions, professed and practised in your Communion, then we cannot be Schismaticks, for refusing to joyn with you in the profession of these Errors, and the practice of these corruptions. And therefore you must free your selves from Error, or us from *Schism.*

52. Lastly, whereas you say, *That you have demonstrated against us, that* Protestants *divided themselves from the*

external Communion of the Viſible Church, add, *which external communion was corrupted,* and we ſhall confeſs the accuſation, and glory in it. But this is not that *Quod erat demonſtrandum,* but that we divided our ſelves from the Church, that is, made our ſelves Out-laws from it, and no members of it. And moreover, in the Reaſon of your ſeparation from the external Communion of your Church you are miſtaken: for it was not ſo much becauſe ſhe, your Church, as becauſe your Churches external Communion was corrupted, and needed Reformation.

53. *That a pretence of Reformation will acquit no man from Schiſm,* we grant very willingly, and therefore ſay, that it concerns every man who ſeparates from any Churches Communion, even as much as his Salvation is worth, to look moſt carefully to it, that the cauſe of his ſeparation be juſt and neceſſary: For unleſs it be neceſſary, it can very hardly be ſufficient. But whether a true Reformation of our ſelves from Errors, ſuperſtitions and impieties, will not juſtifie our ſeparation in theſe things; our ſeparation, I ſay, from them who will not reform themſelves, and as much as in them lies, hinder others from doing ſo: This is the point you ſhould have ſpoken to, but have not. As for the ſentences of the Fathers to which you refer us, for the determination of this Queſtion, I ſuppoſe by what I have ſaid above, the Reader underſtands, by alledging them you have gained little credit to your cauſe or perſon. And that, if they were competent Judges of this Controverſie, their ſentence is againſt you much rather than for you.

56. But your Argument you conceive, will be more convincing, *if we conſider that when* Luther *appeared, there were not two diſtinct Viſible true Churches, one Pure, the other Corrupted, but one Church only. Anſ.* The ground of this is no way certain, nor here ſufficiently proved. For, whereas you ſay, Hiſtories are ſilent of any ſuch matter: I anſwer, there is no neceſſity, that you or I ſhould have read all Hiſtories, that may be extant of this matter; nor that all ſhould be extant that were written, much leſs extant uncorrupted: eſpecially conſidering your Church, which had

had lately all power in her hands, hath been so pernitiously industrious, in corrupting the monuments of Antiquity that made against her; nor that all Records should remain which were written; nor that all should be recorded which was done.

Lastly, whereas you say, that supposing a visible pure Church, *Luther* must be a Schismatick, who separated from all visible Churches: I tell you, if you will suppose a Visible Church extant before and when *Luther* arose, conformable to him in all points of Doctrine, necessary and profitable, then *Luther* separated not from this Church, but adjoyned himself to it: Not indeed in place, which was not necessary, not in external Communion which was impossible, but by the Union of Faith and Charity. Upon these grounds I say, that the ground of this Argument is no way made certain, yet because it is not manifestly false, I am content to let it pass. And for ought I see, it is very safe for me to do so: for you build nothing upon it, which I may not fairly grant. For what do you conclude from hence, but that seeing there was no Visible Church but corrupted, *Luther* forsaking the external Communion of the corrupted Church, could not but forsake the external Communion of the Catholick Church? Well, let this also be granted, what will come of it? What, that *Luther* must be a Schismatick? By no means: For not every separation, but only a causeless separation from the Communion of the Church we maintain to be Schismatical. Hereunto may be added, that though the whole Church were corrupted, yet properly speaking, it is not true, that *Luther* and his Followers forsook the whole corrupted Church, or the external Communion of it: But only that he forsook that Part of it which was corrupted, and still would be so, and forsook not, but only reformed another Part, which Part they themselves were, and I suppose you will not go about to perswade us, that they forsook themselves or their own Communion. And if you urge that they joyned themselves to no other part, therefore they separated from the whole: I say it follows not, in as much as themselves were

a part of it, and ſtill continued ſo: and therefore could no more ſeparate from the whole than from themſelves. Thus though there were no part of the People of *Rome*, to whom the *Plebeians* joyned themſelves, when they made their Seceſſion into the *Aventine Hill*, yet they divided themſelves from the *Patricians* only, and not from the whole People, becauſe themſelves were a part of this People, and they divided not from themſelves.

57. Ad §. 18.] Here you prove that which no man denies, that *corruption in manners yields no ſufficient cauſe to leave the Church:* yet ſure it yields ſufficient cauſe to caſt them out of the Church, that are after the Churches publick admonition obſtinate in notorious impieties. Neither doth the cutting off ſuch men from the Church, lay any neceſſity upon us, either to go out of the World, or out of the Church, but rather puts theſe men out of the Church into the World, where we may converſe with them freely, without ſcandal to the Church, *Our Bleſſed Saviour foretold*, you ſay, *that there ſhould be in the Church Tares with choice Corn.* Look again I pray, and you ſhall ſee, that the field he ſpeaks of, is not the Church, but *the World*: and therefore neither doe You obey our Saviours command, *Let both grow up till the Harveſt*, who teach it to be lawful to root theſe Tears (ſuch are *Hereticks*) out of the World: neither do *Proteſtants* diſobey it, if they eject manifeſt Hereſies and notorious ſinners out of the Church.

58. Ad §. 19.] In the 19. you are ſo courteous as to ſuppoſe *corruptions in your Doctrine*, and yet undertake to prove that, *neither could they afford us any ſufficient cauſe, or colourable neceſſity to depart from them.* Your reaſon is, *becauſe damnable Errors there were none in your Church, by D.* Potters *confeſſion, neither can it be damnable in reſpect of Error, to remain in any Churches Communion, whoſe Errors are not damnable. For if the Error be not damnable, the belief thereof cannot.* Anſw. *D. Potter* confeſſeth no ſuch matter: but only that *he hopes that your Errors, though in themſelves ſufficiently damnable, yet by accident did not damn all that held them:* ſuch he means and ſays, as were excuſably ignorant

norant of Truth, and amongst the number of their unknown sins, repented daily of their unknown Errors. The truth is, he thinks as ill of your Errors and their desert, as you do of ours: only he is not so peremptory and presumptuous in judging your persons, as you are in judging ours, but leaves them to stand or fall to their own Master, who is infinitely merciful, and therefore will not damn them for meer Errors, who desire to find the truth and cannot: and withal infinitely just, and therefore (is it to be feared) will not pardon them, who might easily have come to the knowledge of the truth, and either through Pride, or obstinacy, or neligence would not.

59. To your minor also, I answer almost in your own Words, §. 42. of this Chap. I thank you for your courteous supposal, that your Church may Err, and in recompence thereof, will do you a Charity, by putting you in mind, into what *Labyrinths* you cast your self, by supposing that the Church may Err in some of her Proposals, and yet denying it lawful for any man though he know this, which you suppose, to oppose her judgment, or leave her communion. Will you have such a man dissemble against his Conscience, or externally deny that which he knows true? No, that you will not, for them that do so, you your self have pronounced *A damned Crew of dissembling Sycophants.* Or would you have him continue in your Communion, and yet profess your Church to Err? This you your selves have made to him impossible. Or would you have him believe those things true, which together with him you have supposed to be Errors? This in such a one, as is assured or persuaded of that, which you here suppose, that your Church doth Err, (and such only we say, are obliged to forsake your Communion,) is, as Schoolmen speak, *Implicatio in terminis*, a contradiction so plain, that one word destroyeth another; as if one should say, a living dead man. For it is to require that they which believe some part of your Doctrine false, should withal believe it all true. Seeing therefore, for any man to believe your Church in Error, and profess the contrary, is damnable Hypocrisie; to believe

lieve it and not believe it, a manifeſt repugnancy; and thirdly, to profeſs it and to continue in your Communion (as matters now ſtand) a plain impoſſibility; what remains, but that whoſoever is ſuppoſed to have juſt reaſon to disbelieve any Doctrine of your Church, muſt of neceſſity forſake her Communion? Unleſs you would remit ſo far from your preſent rigour, as to allow them your Churches Communion, who publickly profeſs that they do not believe every Article of her eſtabliſhed Doctrine. Indeed, if you would do ſo, you might with ſome coherence ſuppoſe your Church in Error, and yet find fault with men for abandoning her Communion, becauſe they might continue in it, and ſuppoſe her in Error. But to ſuppoſe your Church in Error, and to excommunicate all thoſe that believe your own ſuppoſition, and then to complain that they continue not in your Communion, is the moſt ridiculous incongruity that can be imagined. And therefore though your corruptions in Doctrine, in themſelves (which yet is falſe) did not, yet your obliging us, to profeſs your Doctrine uncorrupted againſt knowledge and Conſcience, may induce an obligation to depart from your Communion. As if there were any Society of Chriſtians, that held there were no Antipodes; notwithſtanding this Error I might communicate with them. But if I could not do ſo, without profeſſing my ſelf of their belief in this matter, then I ſuppoſe I ſhould be excuſed from Schiſm, if I ſhould forſake their Communion, rather than profeſs my ſelf to believe that which I do not believe. Neither is there any contradiction, or ſhadow of contradiction, that it may be neceſſary for my Salvation, to depart from this Churches Communion: And that this Church (though Erring in this matter) wants nothing neceſſary to Salvation.

60. *That there might be neceſſary cauſe to depart from the Church of* Rome *in ſome Doctrine and practices, though ſhe wanted nothing neceſſary to Salvation as Dr.* Potter holds, and you call a contradiction, will appear by ſetting down his Words, which are theſe; *To forſake the Errors of that Church, and not to joyn with her in thoſe practices which we account*

account erroneous, we are enforced by necessity. For though in the issue they are not damnable to them which believe as they profess, yet for us to profess and avow by Oath (as the Church of Rome *enjoyns) what we believe not, were without question damnable. And they with their Errors, by the grace of God might go to Heaven, when we for our Hypocrisie and dissimulation* (he might have added, and Perjury) *should certainly be condemned to Hell.*

61. Ad §. 20.] *Obj.* But *a Church not Erring in Fundamentals, though Erring in other matters, doth what our Saviour exacts at her hands, doth as much as lies in her power to do: Therefore the Communion of such a Church is not upon pretence of Error to be forsaken.* The consequence is manifest. The Antecedent is proved, because *God, by D.* Potters *confession, hath promised his assistance no further, nor is it in her power to do more than God doth assist her to do.* Pag. 151. 155.

Answ. The promise of Divine Assistance is twofold: Absolute, or Conditional. That there shall be by Divine providence preserved in the World to the Worlds end, such a company of Christians, who hold all things precisely and indispensably necessary to Salvation, and nothing inevitably destructive of it: This and no more the Doctor affirms that God hath promised absolutely. Yet he neither doubts nor denys, but that a farther assistance is conditionally promised us, even such an assistance as shall lead us, if we be not wanting to it and our selves, into all not only necessary, but very profitable truth, and guard us from all not only destructive, but also hurtful Errors. This, I say, he neither denies nor questions. And should he have done so, he might have been confuted by evident and expres Texts of Scripture. When therefore you say, That *a Church not Erring in Fundamentals, doth as much as by Gods assistance lies in her power to do*; This is manifestly untrue. For Gods assistance is alwaies ready to promote her farther. It is ready, I say, but on condition the Church does implore it: on condition, that when it is offerred in the Divine directions of Scripture and reason, the Church be not negligent to follow it. If therefore there be any Church, which retaining the foundation, builds

builds *Hay and Stubble* upon it: which believing what is preciſely neceſſary, Errors ſhamefully and dangerouſly in other things very profitable: This by no means argues defect of Divine aſſiſtance in God, but neglect of this aſſiſtance in the Church. Neither is there any reaſon, why ſuch a Church ſhould pleaſe her ſelf too much, for retaining Fundamental truths, while ſhe remains ſo regardleſs of others. For though the ſimple defect of ſome truths profitable only and not ſimply neceſſary, may conſiſt with Salvation; Yet who is there that can give her ſufficient aſſurance, that the neglect of ſuch truths is not damnable? Beſides, who is there that can put her in ſufficient caution, that theſe Errors about profitable matters may not according to the uſual fecundity of Error, bring forth others of a higher quality, ſuch as are pernitious and peſtilent, and undermine by ſecret conſequences the very foundations of Religion and Piety? Laſtly, who can ſay that ſhe hath ſufficiently diſcharged her duty to God and man by avoiding only Fundamental Hereſies, if in the mean time ſhe be negligent of others, which though they do not plainly deſtroy Salvation, yet obſcure and hinder, and only not block up the way to it? Which though of themſelves and immediately they damn no man, yet are cauſes and occaſions that many men run the race of Chriſtian Piety more remiſly than they ſhould, many defer their repentance, many go on ſecurely in their ſins, and ſo at length are damned by means and occaſion of theſe Errors, though not for them. Such Errors as theſe (though thoſe of the *Roman Church* be much worſe, even *in themſelves damnable, and by accident only pardonable*) yet I ſay ſuch Errors as theſe, if any Church ſhould tolerate, diſſemble and ſuffer them to reign, and neglect to reform them, and not permit them to be freely, yet peaceably, oppoſed and impugned; will any wiſe man ſay, that ſhe hath ſufficiently diſcharged her duty to God and man? That ſhe hath with due fidelity diſpenſed the Goſpel of Chriſt? That ſhe hath done what ſhe could, and what ſhe ought? What ſhall we ſay then, if theſe Errors be taught by her, and commanded to be taught? What if ſhe thunder

der out her curſes againſt thoſe that will not believe them? What if ſhe rave and rage againſt them, and perſecute them with Fire and Sword, and all kinds of moſt exquiſite torments? Truly I do much fear, that from ſuch a Church (though it hold no Error abſolutely unconſiſtent with Salvation,) the Candleſtick of God, either is already removed, or will be very ſhortly, and becauſe ſhe is negligent of profitable truths, that ſhe will loſe thoſe that are Neceſſary, and becauſe ſhe will not be led into all truths, that in ſhort time ſhe ſhall be led into none. And although this ſhould not happen, yet what mortal man can ſecure us, that not only a probable unaffected ignorance, nor only a meer neglect of profitable truths, but alſo a wretchleſs ſupine negligence, manifeſt contempt, Diſſimulation, Oppoſition, Oppreſſion of them, may conſiſt with Salvation? I truly for my part, though I hope very well of all ſuch as ſeeking all truth, find that which is neceſſary; who endeavouring to free themſelves from all Errors, any way contrary to the purity of Chriſtianity, yet fail of performance and remain in ſome: yet if I did not find in my ſelf a love and deſire of all profitable truth; If I did not put away idleneſs, and prejudice, and worldly affections, and ſo examine to the bottom all my opinions of Divine matters, being prepared in mind to follow God, and God only which way ſoever he ſhall lead me; If I did not hope, that I either do, or endeavour to do theſe things, certainly I ſhould have little hope of obtaining Salvation.

62. Obj. *But to oblige any man under pain of damnation to forſake a Church by reaſon of ſuch Errors, againſt which Chriſt thought it ſuperfluous to promiſe his aſſiſtance, and for which he neither denies his grace here, nor his glory hereafter, what is it but to make the narrow way to Heaven, narrower than Chriſt left it? Anſw.* It is not: for Chriſt himſelf hath obliged us hereunto: He hath forbidden us under pain of damnation to profeſs what we believe not, and conſequently under the ſame penalty, to leave that Communion, in which we cannot remain without this hypocritical profeſſion of thoſe things, which we are convinced to be

erroneous. But then beſides, it is here falſely ſuppoſed, (as hath been ſhewed already) that Chriſt hath not promiſed aſſiſtance to thoſe that ſeek it, but only in matters ſimply neceſſary. Neither is there any reaſon, why any Church, even in this World, ſhould deſpair of Victory over all Errors pernitious or noxious; provided ſhe humbly and earneſtly implore Divine aſſiſtance, depend wholly upon it, and be not wanting to it. Though a *Triumph over all ſin and Error*, that is, ſecurity that ſhe neither doth nor can Err, be rather to be deſired than hoped for on Earth, being a felicity reſerved for Heaven.

63. Ad §. 21.] Obj. *But at leaſt the* Roman *Church is as infallible as* Proteſtants, *and* Proteſtants *as fallible as the* Roman *Church: therefore to forſake the* Roman *Church for Errors, what is it but to flit from one Erring Society to another? Anſ.* The inconſequence of this Argument is too apparent: *Proteſtants* may Err as well as the Church of *Rome*, therefore they did ſo! Boys in the Schools know, that *à Poſſe ad Eſſe*, the Argument follows not. He is equally fallible that believes twiſe two to be four, as he that believes them to be twenty: yet in this, he is not equally deceived, and he may be certain that he is not ſo. One Architect is no more infallible than another, and yet he is more ſecure that his work is right and ſtreight who hath made it by the level, than he which hath made it by gueſs and by chance. So he that forſakes the Errors of the Church of *Rome*, and therefore renounceth her Communion, that he may renounce the profeſſion of her Errors, though he knows himſelf fallible, as well as thoſe whom he hath forſaken, yet he may be certain (as certain as the nature of the thing will bear) that he is not herein deceived: becauſe he may ſee the Doctrine forſaken by him repugnant to Scripture, and the Doctrine embraced by him conſonant to it. At leaſt, this he may know, that the Doctrine which he hath choſen to him ſeems true, and the contrary which he hath forſaken, ſeems falſe: And therefore without remorſe of Conſcience, he may profeſs that, but this he cannot.

46. *Obj.*

64. *Obj.* But *we are to remember, that according to Doctor* Potter *the Visible Church hath a blessing not to Err in Fundamentals, in which any private Reformer may fail, therefore there was no necessity of forsaking the Church, out of whose Communion they were exposed to danger of falling into many more, and even into damnable Errors. Answ.* The Visible Church is free indeed from all Errors absolutely destructive and unpardonable, but not from all Error which in it self is damnable: not from all which will actually bring damnation upon them, that keep themselves in them, by their own voluntary and avoidable fault.

Besides, any private man who truly believes the Scripture, and seriously endeavours to know the will of God, and to do it, is as secure as the Visible Church, more secure than your Church from the danger of Erring in Fundamentals: for it is impossible, that any man so quallified should fall into any Error which to him will prove damnable. For God requires no more of any man to his Salvation, but his true endeavour to be saved. Lastly, abiding in your Churches Communion is so far from securing me or any man from damnable Error, that if I should abide in it, I am certain I could not be saved. For abide in it I cannot, without professing to believe your entire Doctrine true: profess this I cannot, but I must lie perpetually, and exulcerate my Conscience. And though your Errors were not in themselves damnable, yet to resist the known Truth, and to continue in the profession of known Errors and falshoods, is certainly a capital sin, and of great affinity with the sin which shall never be forgiven.

65. Obj. *But neither is the* Protestant *Church free from corruptions and Errors: And what man of Judgment will be a* Protestant, *since that Church is confessedly a corrupted one?*

Answ. And yet you your self make large discourses in this very Chapter, to perswade *Protestants* to continue in the Church of *Rome*, though supposed to have some corruptions. And why I pray, may not a man of judgment continue in the Communion of a Church confessedly corrupted, as well as in a Church supposed to be corrupted? Especially when this Church supposed to be corrupted, re-

quires the belief and profeſſion of her ſuppoſed corruptions, as the condition of her Communion: which this Church confeſſedly corrupted, doth not. What man of judgment will think it any diſparagement, to his judgment, to prefer the better, though not ſimply the beſt, before that which is ſtark naught? To prefer indifferrent good health, before a diſeaſed and corrupted ſtate of Body? To prefer a field not perfectly weeded, before a field that is quite over-run with Weeds and Thorns? and therefore though *Proteſtants* have ſome Errors, yet ſeeing they are neither ſo great as yours, nor impoſed with ſuch Tyranny, nor maintained with ſuch obſtinacy; he that conceives it any diſparagement to his judgment, to change your Communion for theirs, though confeſſed to have ſome corruptions, it may well be preſumed that he hath but little judgment.

66. Ad §. 22.] Obj. *But* Proteſtants *ſay, it is comfort enough for the Church to be ſecured from all capital dangers (which can only ariſe from Error in Fundamental points) and not hope to Triumph over all ſin and Error, till ſhe be in Heaven; why therefore were not the firſt Reformers content with enough, but would diſmember the Church, out of greedineſs of more than enough?*

Anſw. I have already ſhewed ſufficiently, how capital danger may ariſe from Errors, though not Fundamental. I add now, that what may be enough for men in ignorance, may be to knowing men not enough: according to that of the Goſpel, *to whom much is given, of him much ſhall be required:* That the ſame Error may be not capital to thoſe who want means of finding the truth, and capital to others who have means, and neglect to uſe them: That to continue in the profeſſion of Error diſcovered to be ſo, may be damnable, though the Error be not ſo. Theſe I preſume are reaſons enough, and enough why the firſt Reformers might think, and juſtly, that not enough for themſelves, which yet to ſome of their Predeceſſors they hope might be enough. This very Argument was objected to [a] S. *Cyprian* upon another occaſion,

[a] *S. Cyprian: Ep.* 63. In theſe words. *Siquis de anteceſſoribus noſtris, vel ignoranter vel ſimpliciter non hæc obſervavit, & tenuit quod nos Dominus facere exemplo & Magiſterio ſuo docuit, poteſt ſimplicitati ejus de indulgentia Domini, venia concedi: nobis verò non poteſt ignoſci, qui nunc à Domino admoniti & inſtructi ſumus.*

sion, and also by the [b] Brittish *Quartodecimans*, to the maintainers of the Doctrine of your Church; and [c] by both this very answer was returned; and therefore I cannot but hope that for their sakes you will approve it.

[b] *Wilfridus*, to *Abbat Colman* alledging that he followed the example of his predeceſſors famous for Holineſs, and famous for Miracles, in theſe Words, *De Patre Veſtro Columba & ſequacibus ejus, quorum ſanctitatem vos imitari & regulam ac præcepta cœleſtibus ſignis confirmata ſequi perhibetis, poſſum reſpondere; Quia multis in judicio dicentibus Domino Quòd in nomine ejus prophetaverint & dæmonia ejecerint, & virtutes multas fecerint, reſponſurus ſit Dominus, quia nunquam eos noverit. Sed abſit ut de patribus veſtris hoc dicam, quia juſtius multo eſt de incognitis bonum credere quam malum. Unde & illos Dei famulos & Deo dilectos eſſe non nego, qui ſimplicitate ruſticâ, ſed intentione piâ Deum dilexerunt: Neque illis multum obeſſe Paſchæ talem reor obſervantiam, quandiu nullus advenerat qui eis inſtituti perfectioris decreta quæ ſequerentur, oſtenderet. Quos utique credo, ſi qui tunc ad eos Catholicus calculator adveniret, ſic ejus monita fuiſſe ſecuturos, quomodo ea quæ noverant ac didicerunt Dei mandata, probantur fuiſſe ſecuti. Tu autem & ſocii tui ſi audita decreta ſedis Apoſtolicæ, imo univerſalis Eccleſiæ & hæc literis ſacris confirmata contemnitis, abſque ulla dubietate peccatis.* [c] Beda: *lib.* 3. *Eccl. Hiſt. c.* 25.

67. Obj. *But if no Church may hope to Triumph over Error, till ſhe be in Heaven, then we muſt either grant, that Errors not Fundamental cannot yield ſufficient cauſe to forſake the Church, or affirm that all communities may and ought to be forſaken.*

Anſw. We do not ſay, that no Church may hope to be free from all Error, either pernitious or any way noxious: But that *no Church may hope to be ſecure from all Error ſimply*, for this were indeed truly to triumph over all. But then we ſay not, that the Communion of any Church is to be forſaken for Errors unfundamental, unleſs it exact with all either a diſſimulation of them being noxious; or a Profeſſion of them againſt the dictate of Conſcience, if they be meer Errors. This if the Church does (as certainly yours doth,) then her Communion is to be forſaken, rather than the ſin of Hypocriſie to be committed. Whereas to forſake the Churches of *Proteſtants* for ſuch Errors, there is no neceſſity, becauſe they Err to themſelves, and do not under pain of Excommunication exact the profeſſion of their Errors.

68. Obj. *But the Church may not be left by reaſon of ſin, therefore neither by reaſon of Errors not Fundamental: in as much*

much as both ſin and Error are impoſſible to be avoided till ſhe be in Heaven. Anſw. The reaſon of the conſequence does not appear to me: But I anſwer to the Antecedent: Neither for ſin or Errors, ought a Church to be forſaken, if ſhe does not impoſe and joyn them: but if ſhe do, (as the *Roman* does,) then we muſt forſake men rather than God; leave the Churches Communion rather than commit ſin, or profeſs known Errors, to be Divine truths. For the Prophet *Ezekiel* hath aſſured us, that to ſay, *the Lord hath ſaid ſo, when the Lord hath not ſaid ſo,* is a great ſin and a high preſumption, be the matter never ſo ſmall.

69. Ad §. 23.] Obj. *But neither the Quality nor the number of your Churches Errors, could warrant our forſaking of it. Not the Quality, becauſe we ſuppoſe them not Fundamental. Not the number becauſe the Foundation is ſtrong enough to ſupport them. Anſw.* Here again you vainly ſuppoſe, that we conceive your Errors in themſelves not damnable: Though we hope they are not abſolutely unpardonable: but to ſay they are pardonable, is indeed to ſuppoſe them damnable. Secondly, though the Errors of your Church did not warrant our departure, yet your Tyrannous impoſition of them, would be our ſufficient juſtification. For this lays neceſſity on us, either to forſake your company, or to profeſs what we know to be falſe.

70. Obj. *Our Bleſſed Saviour hath declared his Will, that we forgive a private offender Seventy Seven times, that is, without limitation of quantity of time, or quality of Treſpaſſes; and then how dare we alledge his command, that we muſt not pardon his Church for Errors acknowledged to be not Fundamental? Anſw.* He that commands us to pardon our Brother ſinning againſt us ſo often, will not allow us for his ſake to ſin with him, ſo much as once. He will have us do any thing but ſin, rather than offend any man. But his will is alſo, that we offend all the World, rather than ſin in the leaſt matter. And therefore though his will were, and it were in our power (which yet is falſe) to pardon the Errors of an Erring Church; yet certainly it is not his will, that we ſhould Err with the Church, or if we do not,

not, that we should against Conscience profess the Errors of it.

71. Ad §. 24.] Obj. *But Schismaticks from the Church of* England *or any other Church, with this very Answer, that they forsake not the Church but the Errors of it, may cast off from themselves the imputation of Schism.* Answ. True, they may make the same Answer, and the same defence as we do, as a Murtherer can cry not guilty, as well as an Innocent person, but not so truly nor so justly. The question is, not what may be pretended, but what can be proved by Schismaticks. They may object Errors to other Churches, as well as we do to yours, but that they prove their accusation so strongly as we can, that appears not. To the Priests and Elders of the *Jews*, imposing that sacred silence mentioned in the *Acts* of the Apostles, S. *Peter* and S. *John* answered *they must obey God rather than men.* The three Children to the King of *Babylon*, gave in effect the same answer. Give me now any factious Hypocrite, who makes Religion the pretence and Cloke of his Rebellion, and who sees not that such a one may answer for himself, in those very formal words, which the Holy Apostles and Martyrs made use of. And yet I presume no Christian will deny, but this answer was good, in the mouth of the Apostles and Martyrs, though it were obnoxious to be used, by Traitors and Rebels. Certainly therefore, it is no good consequence to say, Schismaticks may make use of this Answer, therefore all that do make use of it are Schismaticks. But moreover, it is to be observed, that the cheif part of our defence, that you deny your Communion to all that deny or doubt of any part of your Doctrine, cannot with any colour be imployed against *Protestants*: who grant their Communion to all who hold with them, not all things, but things necessary, that is, such as are in Scripture plainly delivered.

72. Obj. *But the forsaking the* Roman *Church opens a way to innumerable Sects and Schisms, and therefore it must not be forsaken. Answ.* We must not do evil to avoid evil: neither are all courses presently lawful, by which inconveniencies may be avoided. If all men would submit them-

themſelves to the chief Mufty of the *Turks*, it is apparent, there would be no diviſions; yet Unity is not to be purchaſed at ſo dear a rate. It were a thing much to be deſired, that there were no diviſions: yet difference of opinions touching points controverted, is rather to be choſen, than unanimous concord in damned Errors: As it is better for men to go to Heaven by diverſe ways, or rather by divers Paths of the ſame way, than in the ſame path to go on peaceably to Hell. *Amica Pax, magis amica Veritas*! Peace is dear to me, but Truth is dearer.

74. Ad §. 26. 27.] Here you make D. *Potter* to ſay, *that Proteſtants did well to forſake the Church of* Rome, *becauſe they judged ſhe retained all means neceſſary to Salvation. Anſw.* Who was ever ſo ſtupid as to give this ridiculous reaſon? D. *Potter* Vindicates *Proteſtants* for Schiſm two ways: The one is, becauſe they had juſt and great and neceſſary cauſe to ſeparate, which Schiſmaticks never have; becauſe they that have it are no Schiſmaticks: For Schiſm is always a cauſeleſs ſeparation. The other is, becauſe they did not joyn with their ſeparation, an uncharitable damning of all thoſe from whom they did divide themſelves, as the manner of Schiſmaticks is. Now that which he intends for a circumſtance of our ſeparation, you make him make the cauſe of it, and the motive to it. And whereas he ſays, *though we ſeparate from you in ſome things, yet we acknowledge your Church a member of the Body of Chriſt, and therefore are not Schiſmaticks:* You make him ſay moſt abſurdly, *we did well to forſake you, becauſe we judged you a member of the Body of Chriſt.* Juſt as if a Brother ſhould leave his Brothers company in ſome ill courſes, and ſhould ſay to him, Herein I forſake you, yet I leave you not abſolutely, for I acknowledge you ſtill to be my Brother, and ſhall uſe you as a Brother: And you perverting his ſpeech, ſhould pretend that he had ſaid, I leave your company in theſe ill courſes, and I do well to do ſo, becauſe you are my Brother: ſo making that the cauſe of his leaving him, which indeed is the cauſe that he left him no farther.

75. Obj. But you ſay, *The very reaſon for which he acquitteth himſelf for Schiſm, is becauſe he holds that the Church*

Church which they forsook, is not cut off from the Body of Christ.

Ans. This is true: But can you not perceive a difference between justifying his separation from Schism by this reason, and making this the reason of his separation? If a man denying obedience in some unlawful matter to his lawful Sovereign, should say to him, herein I disobey you, but yet I am no Rebel, because I acknowledge you my Sovereign Lord, and am ready to obey you in all things lawful, should not he be an egregious Sycophant, that should accuse him as if he had said, I do well to disobey you, because I acknowledge you my lawful Soveraign? Certainly he that joyns this acknowledgment with his necessitated disobedience, does well; but he that makes this consideration the reason of his disobedience, doth ill.

76. Obj. *It is an unspeakable comfort to Catholicks* (you say) *that we cannot clear our selves from Schism otherwise, than by acknowledging that* we do *not, nor cannot cut off your Church from the hope of salvation.*

Ans. I beseech you to take care that this false comfort cost you not too dear. For why this good opinion of God Almighty, that he will not damn men for error, who were without their own fault ignorant of the truth, should be any consolation to them, who having the key of knowledge, will neither use it themselves, nor permit others to use it; who have eyes to see and will not see, who have ears to hear and will not hear! this I assure you passeth my capacity to apprehend. Neither *is this to make our salvation depend on yours,* but only ours and yours not desperatly inconsistent. Nor to say we *must be damned unless you may be saved*; but that we assure our selves, if our lives be answerable, we shall be saved by our knowledge. And that we hope (and I tell you again *Spes est rei incertæ nomen,*) that some of you may possibly be the rather saved by occasion of their unaffected Ignorance.

80. Ad §. 28. 29. Whereas D. *Potter says, There is a great difference between a Schism from them, and a Reformation of our selves: this* you say *is a quaint subtilty by which all Schism and sin may be as well excused.*

Anſ. It ſeems then in your judgment, that Thieves and Adulterers, and Murtherers, and Traytors may ſay with as much probability as Proteſtants, that they did no hurt to others, but only reform themſelves. But then methinks it is very ſtrange, that all Proteſtants ſhould agree with one conſent in this defence of themſelves from the imputation of Schiſm: and that to this day, never any Thief or Murtherer ſhould have been heard of to make uſe of this Apology! And then for Schiſmaticks I would know, whether *Victor* Biſhop of *Rome*, who excommunicated the Churches of *Aſia* for not conforming to his Church in keeping *Eaſter*; whether *Novatian* that divided from *Cornelius*, upon pretence that himſelf was elected Biſhop of *Rome*, when indeed he was not; whether *Feliciſſimus* and his Crew, that went out of the Church of *Carthage*, and ſet up altar againſt altar, becauſe having fallen in perſecution, they might not be reſtored to the peace of the Church preſently, upon the interceſſion of the Confeſſors; whether the *Donatiſts*, who divided from, and damned all the world, becauſe all the world would not excommunicate them who were accuſed only and not convicted to have been Traditors of the ſacred Books; whether they which for the ſlips and infirmity of others, which they might and ought to tolerate, or upon ſome difference in matters of Order and Ceremony, or for ſome error in Doctrin, neither pernitious nor hurtful to faith or piety, ſeparate themſelves from others, or others from themſelves; or laſtly, whether they that put themſelves out of the Churches unity and obedience, becauſe their opinions are not approved there, but reprehended and confuted, or becauſe being of impious converſation, they are impatient of their Churches cenſure: I would know I ſay, whether all, or any of theſe, may with any face or without extream impudency, put in this plea of Proteſtants, and pretend with as much likelihood as they, that they did not ſeparate from others, but only reform themſelves? But ſuppoſe they were ſo impudent as to ſay ſo in their own defence falſely, doth it follow by any good Logick, that therefore this Apology is not to be imployed by Proteſtants, who may ſay

ſo

so truly? *We make* (say they) *no Schism from you, but only a reformation of our selves: This,* you reply, *is no good justification, because it may be pretended by any Schismatick.* Very true, any Schismatick that can speak may say the same words, (as any Rebel that makes conscience the cloak of his impious disobedience, may say with S. *Peter* and S. *John, we must obey God rather than men*;) But then the question is, whether any Schismatick may say so truly? And to this question you say just nothing: but conclude, because this defence may be abused by some, it must be used by none. As if you should have said, S. *Peter* and S. *John* did ill to make such an answer as they made, because impious Hypocrites might make use of the same to palliate their disobedience and rebellion against the lawful commands of lawful Authority.

81. Obj. *But seeing their pretended Reformation consisted in forsaking the Churches corruptions, their Reformation of themselves, and their division from you, falls out to be one and the same thing.*

Ans. Just as if two men having been a long while companions in drunkenness, one of them should turn sober; this Reformation of himself, and disertion of his companion, in this ill custom, would be one and the same thing, and yet there is no necessity that he should leave his love to him at all, or his society in other things. So Protestants forsaking their own former corruptions, which were common to them with you, could not choose but withal forsake you in the practice of these corruptions: yet this they might, and would have done without breach of Charity towards you; and without a renunciation of your company in any act of piety and devotion, confessedly lawful. And therefore though both these were by accident joyned together, yet this hinders not but that the end they aimed at, was not a separation from you, but a reformation of themselves.

82. Neither *doth their disagreement in the particulars of the Reformation,* (which yet when you measure it without partiality, you'll find to be far short of infinite) *nor their symbolizing in the general of forsaking your corruptions,* prove

any thing to the contrary, or any way advantage your deſign or make for your purpoſe. For it is not any ſign at all, much leſs an evident ſign, that they had no ſetled deſign, but only to forſake the Church of *Rome:* for nothing but malice can deny, that their intent at leaſt was, to reduce Religion to that original purity from which it was fallen. The declination from which, ſome conceiving to have begun (though ſecretly) in the Apoſtles times, *(the myſtery of iniquity being then in work;)* and after their departure to have ſhewed it ſelf more openly: others again believing, that the Church continued pure for ſome Ages after the Apoſtles, and then declined: And conſequently ſome aiming at an exact conformity with the Apoſtolick times: Others thinking they ſhould do God and men good ſervice, could they reduce the Church to the condition of the fourth and fifth ages: Some taking their direction in this work of Reformation, only from Scripture; others from the Writings of Fathers, and the Decrees of Councils of the firſt five Ages: certainly it is no great marvel, that there was, as you ſay, diſagreement between them, in the particulars of their Reformation; nay morally ſpeaking, it was impoſſible it ſhould be otherwiſe. Yet let me tell you, the difference between them (eſpecially in compariſon of your Church and Religion,) is not the difference between good and bad, but between good and better: And they did beſt that followed Scripture, interpreted by Catholick written Tradition: which rule the Reformers of the Church of *England,* propoſed to themſelves to follow.

83. Ad 30. 31, 32.] D. *Potter,* p. 81. 82. of his Book, ſpeak thus. *If a Monaſtery ſhould reform it ſelf, and ſhould reduce into practice ancient good diſcipline, when others would not: In this caſe could it be charged with Schiſm from others, or with Apoſtacy from its rule and order? So in a ſociety of men univerſally infected with ſome diſeaſe, they that ſhould free themſelves from it, could they be therefore ſaid to ſeparate from the ſociety?* He preſumes they could not, and from hence concludes, *That neither can the Reformed Churches be truly accuſed for making a Schiſm, (that is ſeparating from*

from the Church, and making themselves no members of it) if all they did was (as indeed it was) to reform themselves.

84. Now instead of these two instances, which plainly shewed it possible in other societies, and consequently in that of the Church, to leave the faults of a Society, and not leave being of it, you disingenuously foist in two other instances, clean cross to the Doctors purpose, of men under colour of faults, abandoning the Society wherein they lived.

85. But that no suspicion of tergiversation may be fastned upon me, I am content to deal with you a little, at your own weapons. Put the case then, though not just as you would have it, yet with as much favour to you, as in reason you can expect, That a Monastery did observe her substantial vows, and all principal statutes, but yet did generally practise, and also enjoyn the violation of some lesser, yet obliging observances, and had done so time out of mind. And that some inferiour Monks more conscientious than the rest, discovering this abuse, should first with all earnestness sollicite their Superiors for a general and orderly reformation of these, though small and venial corruptions, yet corruptions: But finding they hoped and laboured in vain to effect this, should reform these faults in themselves, and refuse to joyn in the practice of them, with the rest of their Confraternity, and persisting resolutely in such a refusal, should by their Superiors be cast out of their Monastery, and being not to be re-admitted without a promise of remitting from their stiffness in these things, and of condescending to others in the practice of their small faults, should choose rather to continue exiles, than to re-enter upon such conditions: I would know whether you would condemn such men of Apostacy from the Order? Without doubt if you should, you would find the stream of your Casuists against you, and besides, involve S. *Paul* in the same condemnation, who plainly tells, that *we may not do the least evil, that we may do the greatest good.* Put case again, you should be part of a Society universally infected with some disease, and discovering

vering a certain remedy for this diſeaſe, ſhould perſwade the whole company to make uſe of it, but find the greateſt part of them ſo far in love with their diſeaſe, that they were reſolved to keep it; and beſides, ſhould make a decree, that whoſoever would leave it, ſhould leave their company. Suppoſe now that your ſelf and ſome few others, ſhould notwithſtanding their injunction to the contrary, free your ſelves from this diſeaſe, and thereupon they ſhould abſolutely forſake and reject you: I would know in this caſe who deſerves to be condemned, whether you of uncharitable deſertion of your company, or they of a tyrannical peeviſhneſs? And if in theſe caſes you will (as I verily believe you will,) acquit the inferiors and condemn the ſuperiors, abſolve the minor part and condemn the major, then can you with no reaſon condemn Proteſtants, for chooſing rather to be ejected from the communion of the *Roman* Church, than with her to perſiſt (as of neceſſity they were to do, if they would continue in her Communion) in the profeſſion of Errors, though not deſtructive of ſalvation, yet hindering edification, and in the practice, or at leaſt approbati- of many, (ſuppoſe not mortal) but venial corruptions.

86. Beſides, you cenſure too partially the corrupt eſtate of your *Church in comparing it to a Monaſtery, which did confeſſedly obſerve their ſubſtantial Vows, and all principal Statutes of their order; and moreover was ſecured by an infallible aſſiſtance, for the avoiding of all ſubſtantial corruptions:* for of your Church we confeſs no ſuch matter, but ſay plainly, That ſhe not only might fall into ſubſtantial corruptions, but did ſo; that ſhe did not only generally violate, but of all the members of her Communion, either in act or approbation, require and exact the violation of many ſubſtantial Laws of Chriſt, both Ceremonial and Moral, which though we hope it was pardonable in them, who had not means to know their error, yet of its own nature, and to them who did or might have known their error, was certainly damnable. And that it was not the *Tything of Mint and Anniſe, and Cummin*, the neglect whereof we

we impute unto you, but *the neglect of judgment, justice, and the weightier matters of the Law.*

87. Again, you compare Protestants to *such a Company as acknowledge that themselves, as soon as they were gone out of the Monastery that deferred to reform, must not hope to be free from those or the like Errors and Corruptions for which they left their Brethren.* Which is very strange, seeing this very hope and nothing else, moved them to leave your Communion: and this speech of yours, so far as it concerns the same Errors, plainly destroys it self. For how can they possibly fall into the same Errors by forsaking your Communion, which that they may forsake they do forsake your Communion? And then for other errors of the like nature and quality, or more enormous than yours, though they deny it not possible, but by their negligence and wickedness they may fall into them, yet they are so far from acknowledging that they have no hope to avoid this mischief, that they proclaim to all the world, that it is most prone and easie to do so, to all those that fear God and love the truth; and hardly possible for them to do otherwise, without supine negligence and extream impiety.

89. Obj. *But when* Luther *began, he being but one, opposed himself to all, as well Subjects as Superiors.*

Ans. If he did so in the cause of God, it was heroically done of him. This had been without hyperbolizing, *Mundus contra Athanasium*, and *Athanasius contra Mundum*; *the world against* Athanasius, *and* Athanasius *against the world:* neither is it impossible, that *the whole world should so far lie in wickedness* (as S. *John* speaks) that it may be lawful and noble for one man to oppose the world. But yet were we put to our Oaths, we should surely not testifie any such thing for you; for how can we say properly and without straining, that *he opposed himself to All,* unless we could say also, that All opposed themselves to him? And how can we say so, seeing the world can witness, that so many thousands, nay millions followed his standard as soon as it was advanced.

90. But

90. But *none that lived immediatly before him thought or ſpake as he did.* This firſt is nothing to the purpoſe. The Church was then corrupted, and ſure it was no diſhonour to him to begin the Reformation. In the Chriſtian warfare, every man ought to ſtrive to be foremoſt. Secondly, it is more than you can juſtifie. For though no man before him lifted up his voice like a Trumpet, as *Luther* did, yet who can aſſure us, but that many before him, both thought and ſpake in lower voice of Petitions and Remonſtrances, in many points, as he did?

91. Obj. *Many chief learned Proteſtants, are forced to confeſs the Antiquity of your Doctrin and practice.*

Anſ. Of many Doctrins and practices of yours this is not true; for I pray inform me, what confeſſions of Proteſtants have you, for the Antiquity of the Doctrin of the Communion in one kind: the lawfulneſs and expedience of the *Latin Service*: For the preſent uſe of Indulgences: For the Popes power in Temporalties over Princes: For the picturing of the Trinity: For the lawfulneſs of the worſhip of Pictures: For your Beads and Roſary, and Ladies Pſalter; and in a word, for your whole worſhip of the Bleſſed Virgin: For your oblations by way of conſumption, and therefore in the quality of Sacrifices to the Virgin *Mary* and other Saints: For your ſaying of *Pater noſters*, and Creeds to the honour of Saints, and of *Ave-Maries* to the honour of other Saints beſides the Bleſſed Virgin: For infallibility of the Biſhop or Church of *Rome*: For your prohibiting the Scripture to be read publickly in the Church, in ſuch Languages as all may underſtand: For your Doctrin of the Bleſſed Virgins immunity from actual ſin; and for your doctrin and worſhip of her Imaculate conception: For the neceſſity of Auricular Confeſſion: For the neceſſity of the Prieſts intention to obtain benefit by any of your Sacraments: And laſtly (not to trouble my ſelf with finding out more) for this very doctrin of Licentiouſneſs, That though a man live and die without the practice of Chriſtian vertues, and with the habits of many damnable ſins unmortified, yet if he in the laſt moment of life, have any ſorrow for his ſins, and joyn con-

confession with it, certainly he shall be saved? Besides, though some *Protestants* confess some of your Doctrine to be Ancient, yet this is nothing, so long as it is evident, even by the confession of all sides, that many Errors, I instance in that of the *Millenaries*, and the Communicating of Infants, were more Ancient. Not any antiquity thereof, unless it be absolute and primitive, is a certain sight of true Doctrine. For if the Church were obnoxious to corruption (as we pretend it was,) who can possible warrant us that part of this corruption, might not get in and prevail in the 5. or 4. or 3. or 2. Age? Especially seeing the Apostles assure us that the *mystery of iniquity was working*, though more secretly even in their times. If any man ask how could it become Universal in so short a time? Let him tell me how the Error of the *Millenaries*, and the Communicating of Infants, became so soon Universal, and then he shall acknowledge, what was done in some, was possible in others. Lastly, to cry quittance with you: As there are *Protestants* who confess the Antiquity, but always post-nate to Apostolick, of some points of your Doctrine: so there want not *Papists* who acknowledge as freely, the novelty of many of them, and the Antiquity of ours. A collection of whose Testimony, we have (without thanks to you) in your *Indices expurgatorii*: The Divine Providence, blessedly abusing for the readier manifestation of the Truth this Engine intended by you for the subversion and suppression of it. Here is no place to stand upon particulars: only one general ingenuous confession of that great *Erasmus*, may not be passed over in silence. *Non desunt magni Theologi, qui non verentur affirmare, nihil esse in* Luthero, *quin per probatos authores defendi possit. There want not great Divines, which stick not to affirm, that there is nothing in* Luther, *which may not be defended by good and allowed authors.* *Erasm. Ep. lib. 15. Ep. ad Godescalcum. Ros.*

92. After this you compose a heap of vain suppositions, pretended to be grounded on our confessions. As first, *that your Deseases which we forsook, neither were nor could be mortal*: whereas we assure our selves, and are ready to justifie, that they are and were mortal in themselves,

and would have been so to us, if when light came to us we had loved Darkness more than Light. Secondly, *that we had no hope to avoid other Diseases like those for which we forsook your company, nor to be secure out of it from damnable Errors:* whereas, in truth, the hope hereof was the only motive of our departure; and we assure our selves that the means to be secured from damnable Error, is not to be secure as you are, but carefully to use those means of avoiding it, to which God hath promised, and will never fail to give a blessing. Thirdly, that *those innumerable mischiefs which followed upon the departure of* Protestants, *were caused by it as by a proper cause:* whereas their Doctrine was no otherwise the occasion of them, than the Gospel of Christ was of the division of the World. The only Fountain of all these mischiefs, being indeed no other than your pouring out a Flood of persecutions against *Protestants,* only because they would not sin & be damned with you for company. Unless we may add the impatience of some *Protestants,* who not enduring to be Torn in peeces like Sheep by a company of Wolves without resistance, chose rather to die like Soldiers than Martyrs.

96. Obj. *But they endeavoured to force the Society whereof they were parts to be healed and reformed as they were; and if it refused, they did, when they had power drive them away, even their superiours both Spiritual and Temporal as is notorious.* The proofs hereof are wanting and therefore I might defer my answer until they were produced; yet take this beforehand: If they did so, then herein, in my opinion, they did amiss; for I have learnt from the Ancient Fathers of the Church, that *nothing is more against Religion than to force Religion,* and of S. *Paul, the Weapons of the Christian Warfare are not carnal.* And great reason: For humane violence may make men counterfeit, but cannot make them believe, and is therefore fit for nothing but to breed form without, and *Atheism* within. Besides, if this means of bringing men to embrace any Religion were generally used (as if it may be justly used in any place by those that have power, and think they have truth, certainly they cannot with reason deny but that it may be used in every place,

place, by those that have power as well as they, and think they have truth as well as they,) what could follow but the maintainance perhaps of truth, but perhaps only of the profession of it in one place, and the oppression of it in a hundred? What will follow from it but the preservation peradventure of Unity, but peradventure only of uniformity in particular States and Churches; but the immortallizing the greater and more lamentable divisions of Christendom and the World? And therefore what can follow from it, but perhaps in the judgment of carnal policy, the temporal benefit and tranquillity of temporal States and kingdoms, but the infinit prejudice, if not the desolation of the kingdom of Christ? And therefore it well becomes them who have their portions in this life, who serve no higher State than that of *England*, or *Spain*, or *France*, nor this neither any further than they may serve themselves by it; who think of no other happiness but the preservation of their own fortunes and tranquillity in this World; who think of no other means to preserve States, but humane power and Machiavillian policy; and believe no other Creed but this, *Regi aut Civitati imperium habenti nihil injustum, quod utile!* that to a King or City that has Ruling Power, nothing that is profitable is unjust. Such men as these it may become to maintain by worldly power and violence their State-instrument, Religion. For if all be vain and false, (as in their judgment it is) the present whatsoever, is better than any, because it is already setled: and alteration of it may draw with it change of States, and the change of State the subversion of their fortune. But they that are indeed Servants and lovers of Christ, of Truth, of the Church, and of Man-kind, ought with all courage to oppose themselves against it, as a common Enemy of all these. They that know there is a King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, by whose will and pleasure Kings and Kingdoms stand and fall, they know, that to no King or State any thing can be profitable which is unjust; and that nothing can be more evidently unjust, than to force weak men by the profession of a Religion which they believe not,

to loſe their own Eternal Happineſs, out of a vain and needleſs fear, leſt they may poſſibly diſturb their temporal quietneſs. There is no danger to any ſtate from any mans opinion; unleſs it be ſuch an opinion by which diſobedience to authority, or impiety is taught or licenced, which ſort, I confeſs may juſtly be puniſhed as well as other faults; or unleſs this ſanguinary Doctrine be joyned with it, that it is lawful for him by humane violence to enforce others to it. Therefore if *Proteſtants* did offer violence to other Mens Conſciences and compel them to embrace their Reformation, I excuſe them not: much leſs if they did ſo to the ſacred Perſons of Kings, and thoſe that were in authority over them, who ought to be ſo ſecured from violence, that even their unjuſt and Tyrannous violence, though it may be avoided (according to that of our Saviour, *When they perſecute you in one Citty fly into another*,) yet may it not be reſiſted by oppoſing violence againſt it. *Proteſtants* therefore that were guilty of this crime, are not to be excuſed, and bleſſed had they been, had they choſen rather to be Martyrs than Murtherers, and to die for their Religion rather than to fight for it. But of all the men in the World you are the moſt unfit to accuſe them hereof, againſt whom the Souls of Martyrs from under the Altar cry much louder than againſt all their other Perſecutors together: Who for theſe many Ages together have daily ſacrificed *Hecatombs* of Innocent Chriſtians, under the name of Hereticks, to your blind zeal and furious ſuperſtition. Who teach plainly, that you may propagate your Religion whenſoever you have power by depoſing of Kings and Invaſion of Kingdoms, and think when you kill the Adverſaries of it, you do God good ſervice. But for their departing corporally from them, whom mentally they had forſaken: For their forſaking the external Communion and company of that part of the unreformed part of the Church, in their ſuperſtitions and impieties: thus much of your accuſation we embrace and glory in it; And ſay though ſome Proteſtants might offend in the manner or the degree of their ſeparation, yet certainly their ſeparation it ſelf was not Schiſmatical, but Innocent, and not only ſo, but juſt and neceſſary.

99. Ad

99. Ad §. 36.] What you cite out of *Optatus* (*l. 2. cont. Parm. Thou canst not deny but that thou knowest, that in the City of* Rome *there was first an Episcopal Chair placed for* Peter, *wherein* Peter *the head of the Apostles sate, whereof also he was called* Cephas; *in which one Chair Unity was to be kept by all, lest the other Apostles might attribute to themselves each one his particular Chair; and that he should be a Schismatick and sinner, who against that one single Chair should erect another.* All this is impertinent, if it be well lookt into. The truth is the *Donatists* had set up at *Rome* a Bishop of their faction: not with intent to make him Bishop of the whole Church but of that Church in particular. Now *Optatus* going upon S. *Cyprians* ground *of one Bishop in one Church,* proves them Schismatick for so doing, by this Argument: S. *Peter* was first Bishop of *Rome,* neither did the Apostles attribute to themselves each one his particular Chair, (viz. *in that City,* for in other places others I hope had Chairs besides S. *Peter*) and therefore he is a Schismatick, who against that one single Chair erects another (viz. *in that place*) making another Bishop of that Dioceſs besides him who was lawfully elected to it.

100. *Obj.* But *he stiles S.* Peter *Head of the Apostles, and says that from thence he was called* Cephas.

Answ. Perhaps he was abused into this opinion, by thinking *Cephas* derived from the Greek word Κεφαλὴ a head: whereas it is a *Syriack* word and signifies a Stone. Besides S. *Peter* might be head of the Apostles, that is first in order and honour among them, and not have supream Authority over them. And indeed that S. *Peter* should have authority over all the Apostles, and yet exercise no one Act of Authority over any one of them, and that they should shew to him no sign of subjection, methinks is as strange, as that a King of *England* for twenty five years should do no Act of Regality, nor receive any one acknowledgment of it. As strange methinks it is, that you so many Ages after, should know this so certainly, as you pretend to do, and that the Apostles (after that those words were spoken in their hearing, by vertue whereof S. *Peter* is pretended to have

have been made their Head,) ſhould ſtill be ſo ignorant of it, as to queſtion *which of them ſhould be the greateſt?* yet more ſtrange, that our Saviour ſhould not bring them out of their Error, by telling them S. *Peter* was the man, but rather confirm it by ſaying, *the Kings of the Gentiles exerciſe authority over them, but it ſhould not be ſo among them.* No leſs a wonder was it that S. *Paul* ſhould ſo far forget S. *Peter* and himſelf, as that firſt mentioning him often, he ſhould do it without any Title of Honour. Secondly, ſpeaking of the ſeveral degrees of men in the Church, he ſhould not give S. *Peter* the higheſt, but place him in equipage with the reſt of the Apoſtles, and ſay, *God hath appointed* (not *firſt* Peter, *then the reſt* of the Apoſtles, but) *firſt Apoſtles, ſecondly Prophets.* Certainly if the Apoſtles were *all firſt*, to me it is very probable, that no one of them was before the reſt. For by *Firſt*, all men underſtand either that which is before all, or that before which is nothing. Now in the former ſenſe, the Apoſtles could not be all firſt, for then every one of them muſt have been before every one of the reſt. And therefore they muſt be *Firſt* in the other ſenſe. And therefore, No man, and therefore not S. *Peter*, muſt be before any of them. Thirdly and Laſtly, that ſpeaking of himſelf in particular, and perhaps comparing himſelf with S. *Peter* in particular, rather than any other, he ſhould ſay in plain terms, *I am in nothing inferior to the very Chiefeſt Apoſtles.* But beſides all this, though we ſhould grant againſt all theſe probabilities and many more, that *Optatus* meant that S. *Peter* was head of the Apoſtles, not in our but in your ſenſe, and that S. *Peter* indeed was ſo; yet ſtill you are very far from ſhewing, that in the judgment of *Optatus*, the Biſhop of *Rome*, was to be at all, much leſs by Divine right, ſucceſſor to S. *Peter* in this his Headſhip and Authority. For what incongruity is there, if we ſay, that he might ſucceed S. *Peter* in that part of his care, the Government of that particular Church, (as ſure he did even while S. *Peter* was living,) and yet that neither he nor any man was to ſucceed him in his Apoſtleſhip, nor in his Government

of

of the Church Universal? Especially seeing S. *Peter* and the rest of the Apostles, by laying the Foundations of the Church, were to be the *Foundations of it*, and accordingly are so called in Scripture. And therefore as in a building it is incongruous that Foundations should succeed Foundations: So it may be in the Church, that any other Apostle should succeed the first.

101. Ad §. 37.] *Obj.* What you here cite out of S. *Austin*; if it be applied to *Luther*'s Separation, is impertinent. For it is one thing to separate from the Communion of the whole World, another to separate from all the Communions in the World: One thing to divide from them who are United among themselves, another to divide from them who are divided among themselves. Now the *Donatists* separated from the whole World of Christians, United in one Communion, professing the same Faith, serving God after the same manner, which was a very great Argument, that they could not have just cause to leave them: according to that of *Tertullian, Variasse debuerat error Ecclesiarum, quod autem apud multos unum est, non est Erratum sed Traditum.* But *Luther* and his followers did not so. The World, I mean of Christians and Catholicks, was divided and subdivided long before he divided from it; and by their divisions had much weakened their own Authority, and taken away from you this Plea of S. *Austin*, which stands upon no other Foundation, but the Unity of the whole Worlds Communion.

102. Ad §. 38.] Obj. *If* Luther *were in the right, most certain those* Protestants *that differed from him were in the wrong.*

Answ. But that either he or they were Schismaticks, it follows not. Or if it does, then either the Jesuits are Schismaticks from the *Dominicans*, or they from the Jesuites; The *Canonists* from the Jesuits, or the Jesuits from the *Canonists*: The *Scotists* from the *Thomists*, or they from the *Scotists*: The *Franciscans* from the *Dominicans*, or the *Dominicans* from the *Franciscans*. For between all these the World knows, that in point of Doctrine, there is plain and irreconcileable contradiction, and therefore one Part must be in Error, at least not Fundamental. Thus your Argument

gument returns upon your ſelf, and if it be good, proves the *Roman* Church in a manner to be made up of Schiſmaticks. But the anſwer to it is, that it begs this very falſe and vain ſuppoſition; That whoſoever Errs in any point of Doctrine is a Schiſmatick.

103. Ad §. 39.] In the next place you number up your Victories, and tell us, *that out of theſe premiſes, this concluſion follows, That* Luther *and his followers were Schiſmaticks from the Viſible Church, the* Pope, *the Dioceſs wherein they were baptized, from the Biſhop under whom they lived, from the Country to which they belonged, from their Religious order, wherein they were profeſſed, from one another, and laſtly, from a mans ſelf: Becauſe the ſelf ſame* Proteſtant *is convicted to day, that his yeſterdays opinion was an Error.* To which I anſwer, that *Luther* and his followers ſeparated from many of theſe, in ſome opinions and practices: But that they did it without cauſe, which only can make them Schiſmaticks, that was the only thing you ſhould have proved, and to that you have not urged one reaſon of any moment. All of them for weight and ſtrength, were couſin-germans to this pretty device, wherewith you will prove them Schiſmaticks from themſelves, *becauſe the ſelf ſame* Proteſtant *to day is convicted in Conſcience, that his yeſterdays opinion was an Error.* It ſeems then that they that hold Errors, muſt hold them faſt, and take eſpecial care of being convicted in Conſcience, that they are in Error, for fear of being Schiſmaticks! *Proteſtants* muſt continue *Proteſtants*, and *Puritans Puritans*, and *Papiſts Papiſts*, nay *Jews*, and *Turks*, and *Pagans*, muſt remain *Jews*, and *Turks*, and *Pagans*, and go on conſtantly to the Devil, or elſe forſooth they muſt be *Schiſmaticks*, and that *from themſelves*. And this perhaps is the cauſe that makes *Papiſts* ſo obſtinate, not only in their common ſuperſtition, but alſo in adhering to the proper fancies of their ſeveral Sects, ſo that it is a miracle to hear of any Jeſuit, that hath forſaken the opinion of the Jeſuits: or any *Dominican* that hath changed his or the Jeſuits.

But ſure the forſaking of error cannot be a ſin, unleſs to be in error be a vertue. And therefore, to do as you

do,

do, to damn men for false opinions, and to call them Schismaticks for leaving them; to make pertinacy in error, that is, an unwillingness to be convicted, or a resolution not to be convicted, the form of Heresies, and to find fault with men, for being convicted in conscience that they are in error, is the most incoherent and contradictious injustice that ever was heard of. But Sir, if this be a strange matter to you, that which I shall tell you will be much stranger. I know a man that of a moderate Protestant turned a Papist, and the day that he did so, (as all things that are done are perfected some day or other,) was convicted in conscience, that his yesterdays opinion was an error, and yet thinks he was no Schismatick for doing so, and desires to be informed by you, whether or no he was mistaken? The same man afterwards upon better consideration, became a doubting Papist, and of a doubting Papist, a confirmed Protestant. And yet this man thinks himself no more to blame for all these changes, than a Traveller, who using all diligence to find the right way to some remote City, where he never had been, (as the party I speak of had never been in Heaven,) did yet mistake it, and after find his error, and amend it. Nay he stands upon his justification so far, as to maintain that his alterations, not only to you, but also from you by Gods mercy, were the most satisfactory actions to himself, that ever he did, and the greatest victories that ever he obtained over himself, and his affections to those things which in this world are most precious; as wherein for Gods sake and (as he was verily perswaded,) out of love to the Truth, he went upon a certain expectation of those inconveniences, which to ingenuous natures are of all most terrible. So that though there were much weakness in some of these alterations, yet certainly there was no wickedness. Neither does he yield his weakness altogether without apology, seeing his deductions were rational, and out of Principles commonly received by Protestants as well as Papists, and which by his education had got possession of his understanding.

107. Ad §. 41.] Obj. *Though the firſt Reformers had conceived their own opinions to be true, yet they might and ought to have doubted, whether they were certain; ſince they affirm, that Infallibility was not promiſed to particular perſons or Churches.*

Anſ. This is to ſay, that they ought to have doubted of the certainty of Scripture, which in formal and expreſs terms, contains many of theſe opinions. And your reaſon is vain; for *though they had not an abſolute infallibility promiſed unto them,* yet may they be of ſome things infallibly certain. As *Euclide* ſure was not infallible, yet he was certain enough, that *twice two were four,* and *that every whole was greater than a part of that whole.* And ſo though *Calvin* and *Melancton* were not infallible in all things, yet they might and did know well enough, that your *Latin-Service* was condemned by S. *Paul,* and that the Communion in both kinds was taught by our Saviour.

Obj. But *your Church was in peaceable poſſeſſion* (you muſt mean of her Doctrin and the Profeſſors of it) *and enjoyed preſcription for many Ages.*

Anſ. The poſſeſſion which the Governors of your Church held for ſome ages, of the party governed, was not peaceable, but got by fraud and held by violence.

108. Obj. You ſay that *a pretence of Conſcience will not ſerve to juſtifie ſeparation from being Schiſmatical.*

Anſ. This is very true but little to the purpoſe, ſeeing it is not an erroneous perſwaſion, much leſs an hypocritical pretence, but a true and well grounded conviction of Conſcience, which we alledge to juſtifie Proteſtants from being Schiſmatical. And therefore though Seditious men in Church and State, may pretend conſcience for a cloak of their rebellion: yet this I hope hinders not, but that an honeſt man ought to obey his rightly informed conſcience, rather than the unjuſt commands of his Tyrannous Superiors. Otherwiſe with what colour can you defend either your own refuſing the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy? Or the ancient Martyrs, and Apoſtles, and Prophets, who oftentimes diſobeyed the commands of men in authority, and for their diſobedience made

made no other but this Apology, *We must obey God rather than men?* It is therefore most apparent that this answer must be meerly impertinent: seeing it will serve against the Martyrs and Apostles and Prophets, and even against your selves, as well as against Protestants. To as little purpose is your rule out of *Lyrinensis* against them that followed *Luther*, seeing they pretend and are ready to justifie, that they forsook not, with the Doctors, the faith, but only the corruption of the Church. As vain altogether is that which follows: That *in cases of uncertainty we are not to leave our Superior, or cast off his obedience, nor publickly oppose his decrees.* From whence it will follow very evidently, that seeing it is not a matter of faith, but a disputed question among you, whether the Oath of Allegiance be lawful: that either you acknowledge not the King your Superior, or do against conscience, in opposing his and the kingdoms decree, requiring the taking of this Oath. This good use, I say, may very fairly be made of it, and is by men of your own Religion.

109 Ad §. 42.] Obj. *It is not fit*, you say, *for any private man to oppose his judgment to the publick.*

Ans. Not his own judgment and bare authority; but occasions may happen, wherein it may be very warrantable, to oppose his reason or the authority of Scripture against it: and is not then to be esteemed to oppose his own judgment to the publick, but the judgment of God to the judgment of men.

Neither will Mr. *Hookers* words you cite do you any service. For though he says (*Pref.* to *Eccles. polit.* see 6. *pag.* 28.) *that men are bound to do whatsoever the sentence of judicial and final decision shall determine*; as it is plain men are bound to yield such an obedience to all Courts of civil judicature: yet he says not, they *are bound to think* that determination lawful and that sentence just. Nay it is plain he says, that *they must do according to the Judges sentence, though in their private opinion it seem unjust.* As if I be wrongfully cast in a suit at Law, and sentenced to pay an hundred pound, I am bound to pay the money, yet I know no Law of God or man, that binds me in conscience

to acquit the Judge of error in his sentence. Neither is there any *necessity*, as you say, *that he must either* acknowledge the *Universal Infallibility of the Church, or drive men into dissembling against their Conscience*; seeing nothing hinders, but I may obey the sentence of a Judge, paying the mony he awards me to pay, or forgoing the house or land which he hath judged from me, and yet withal plainly profess, that in my Conscience I conceive his Judgment erroneous. To which purpose they have a saying in *France*, that *whosoever is cast in any cause, hath liberty for ten days after, to rail at his Judges.*

110. But observe, I pray, that Mr. *Hooker* says not absolutely and in all their causes; but onely *in litigious causes, of the quality of those whereof he* there treats; In such matters as have plain Scripture or reason neither for them nor against them, and wherein men are perswaded this or that way, *upon their own only probable collection*; in such cases, *This perswasion* (saith he) *ought to be fully setled in mens hearts, that the will of God is, that they should not disobey the certain commands of their lawful Superiors, upon uncertain grounds: But do that which the sentence of judicial and final decision shall determin.* For the purpose, a Question there is, whether a Surplice may be worn in Divine Service: The authority of Superiors injoyns this Ceremony, and neither Scripture nor reason plainly forbids it. *Sempronius* notwithstanding, is by some inducements, which he confesses to be onely probable, lead to this perswasion that the thing is unlawful. The *quære* is, whether he ought for matter of practice follow the injunction of authority, or his own private and only probable perswasion? M. *Hooker* resolves for the former, upon this ground, that the *certain commands of the Church we live in, are to be obeyed in all things, not certainly unlawful.*

As for requiring a blind and an unlimited obedience, to Ecclesiastical decisions universally and in all cases, even when plain Text or reason seems to controul them, M. *Hooker* is as far from making such an Idol of Ecclesiastical Authority, as the Puritans whom he writes against. *I grant* (saith he,) *that proof derived from the authority of mans*

mans judgment, is not able to work that assurance which doth grow by a stronger proof. And therefore although ten thousand General Councils would set down one and the same definitive sentence, concerning any point of Religion whatsoever, yet one demonstrative reason alledged, or one manifest testimony cited from the word of God himself, to the contrary, could not choose but over-weigh them all: in as much as for them to be deceived it is not impossible, it is that Demonstrative Reason, or Divine Testimony should deceive. And again, *Whereas it is thought, that especially with the Church, and those that are called, mans authority ought not to prevail: It must and doth prevail even with them, yea with them especially, as far as equity requireth, and farther we maintain it not. For men to be tied and led by authority, as it were with a kind of captivity of judgment, and though there be reason to the contrary, not to listen to it, but to follow like beasts, the first in the Herd, this were brutish.* Again, *that authority of men should prevail with men either against or above reason, is no part of our belief. Companies of learned men, be they never so great and reverend, are to yield unto reason, the weight whereof, is no whit prejudiced by the simplicity of his person which doth alledge it, but being found to be sound and good, the bare opinion of men to the contrary, must of necessity stoop and give place.* Thus M. *Hooker* in his Seventh Section of his Second Book.

112. Ad §. 43.] The next Section hath in it some objections against *Luthers* person, but none against his cause, which alone I have undertaken to justifie, and therefore I pass it over. Yet this I promise, that when you, or any of your side, shall publish a good defence, of all that your Popes have said and done, especially of them whom *Bellarmine* believes, in such a long train *to have gone to the Devil:* then you shall receive an ample Apology for all the actions and words of *Luther.* In the mean time, I hope all reasonable and equitable Judges, will esteem it not unpardonable in the great and Heroical spirit of *Luther,* if being opposed, and perpetually baited with a world of Furies, he were transported sometimes, and made somewhat furious. As for you, I desire you to be quiet, and to demand no more, whether God be wont to send such Furies

ries to preach the Goſpel? Unleſs you deſire to hear of your killing of Kings: Maſſacring of Peoples; Blowing up of Parliaments: and have a mind to be ask't, whether it be probable, that that ſhould be Gods cauſe, which needs to be maintained by ſuch Deviliſh means?

CHAP. VI.

The ANSWER to the Sixth CHAPTER.

Shewing that Proteſtants are not Hereticks.

Ad §. 1. HE that will accuſe any one man, much more any great multitude of men of any great and horrible crime, ſhould in all reaſon and juſtice take care that the greatneſs of his evidence do equal, if not exceed the quality of the crime. And ſuch an accuſation you would here make ſhew of, by pretending, firſt, *to lay ſuch grounds of it, as are either already proved, or elſe yielded on all ſides:* and after to raiſe a firm and ſtable ſtructure of convincing arguments upon them. But both theſe I find to be meer and vain pretences, and having conſidered this Chapter alſo without prejudice or paſſion, as I did the former, I am enforced by the light of Truth, to pronounce your whole diſcourſe, a painted and ruinous Building upon a weak and ſandy foundation.

2. Ad §. 2, 3. Firſt for your grounds, a great part of them, is falſely ſaid to be either proved or granted. It is true indeed that *Man by his natural wit and induſtry could never have attained to the knowledge of Gods will to give him a ſupernatural and eternal happineſs,* nor of the means by which his pleaſure was to beſtow this happineſs upon him. And therefore your firſt ground is good, *That it was requiſite his underſtanding ſhould be enabled to apprehend that end and means by a knowledge ſupernatural.* I ſay this is good, if you mean by *knowledge,* an apprehenſion or belief.

3. But

3. But then whereas you add, *that if a ſuch a knowledge were no more than probable, it could not be able ſufficiently to overbear our will, and encounter with human probabilities, being backed with the ſtrength of fleſh and blood, and therefore conclude, that it was farther neceſſary, that this ſupernatural knowledge ſhould be moſt certain and infallible:* To this I anſwer, that I do heartily acknowledge and believe the Articles of our Faith be in themſelves Truths, as certain and infallible as the very common Principles of Geometry and Metaphyſicks. But that there is required of us a knowledge of them, and an adherence to them, as certain as that of ſenſe or ſcience, that ſuch a certainty is required of us under pain of damnation, ſo that no man can hope to be in the ſtate of ſalvation, but he that finds in himſelf ſuch a degree of faith, ſuch a ſtrength of adherence: This I have already demonſtrated to be a great error, and of dangerous and pernitious conſequence. And becauſe I am more and more confirmed in my perſwaſion that the Truth which I there delivered, is of great and ſingular uſe, I will here confirm it with more reaſons. And to ſatisfie you that this is no ſingularity of my own my Margent preſents you with a [a] Proteſtant Divine of great authority, and no way ſingular in his opinions, who hath long ſince preached and juſtified the ſame doctrin.

[a] M. *Hooker* in his anſwer to *Travers* his ſupplication. — I have taught that the aſſurance of things which we believe by the word, is not ſo certain as of that we perceive by ſence. And is it as certain? Yea I taught, that the things which God doth promiſe in his word are ſurer unto us than any thing we touch, handle or ſee. But are we ſo ſure and certain of them? If we be, why doth God ſo often prove his promiſes unto us, as he doth by arguments taken from our ſenſible experience? We muſt be ſurer of the proof than the thing proved, otherwiſe it is no proof. How is it that if ten men do all look upon the Moon, every one of them knows it as certainly to be the Moon as another: but many believing one and the ſame promiſes all have not one and the ſame fulneſs of perſwaſion? How falleth it out that men being aſſured of any thing by ſence, can be no ſurer of it than they are? whereas the ſtrongeſt in faith that liveth upon the earth, had always need to labour, and ſtrive, and pray, that his aſſurance concerning heavenly and ſpiritual things may grow, increaſe, and be augmented.

4. I ſay that every Text of Scripture which makes mention of any that were *weak*, or of any that were *ſtrong in faith:* of any that were *of little*, or any that were *of great faith:* of

of any that *abounded*, or any that were *rich* in faith: of *encreasing, growing, rooting, grounding, establishing, confirming in faith:* Every such Text, is a demonstrative refutation of this vain fancy: proving that faith, even true and saving faith, is not a thing consisting in such an indivisible point of perfection as you make it, but capable of augmentation and diminution. Every Prayer you make to God to encrease your faith (or if you conceive such a prayer derogatory from the perfection of your faith, (*The Apostles praying to Christ to encrease their Faith*, is a convincing argument of the same conclusion. Moreover if this doctrin of yours were true, then seeing not any the least doubting can consist with a most infallible certainty, it will follow that every least doubting in any matter of faith, though resisted and involuntary, is a damnable sin, absolutely destructive, so long as it lasts, of all true and saving faith: which you are so far from granting, that you make it no sin at all, but only an occasion of merit: and if you should esteem it a sin, then must you acknowledge, contrary to your own Principles, that there are Actual sins meerly involuntary. The same is furthermore invincibly confirmed by every deliberate sin that any Christian commits; by any progress in Charity that he makes. For seeing, as S. *John* assures us, *our faith is the victory which overcomes the world*, certainly if the faith of all true Believers were perfect, (and if true faith be capable of no imperfection, if all faith be a knowledge most certain and infallible, all faith must be perfect, for the most imperfect that is, according to your doctrin, if it be true, must be *most certain*, and sure the most perfect that is, cannot be more than most certain,) then certainly their victory over the World, and therefore over the flesh, and therefore over sin, must of necessity be perfect, and so it should be impossible for any true believer to commit any deliberate sin, and therefore he that commits any sin, must not think himself a true believer. Besides seeing Faith worketh by Charity, and Charity is the effect of Faith: certainly if the cause were perfect, the effect would be perfect, and consequently as you make no degrees in Faith, so there would be none in Charity, and so no man

man could poſſibly make any progreſs in it, but all true believers ſhould be equally in Charity, as in Faith you make them equal: and from thence it would follow unavoidably, that whoſoever finds in himſelf any true Faith, muſt preſently perſuade himſelf that he is perfect in Charity: and whoſoever on the other ſide, diſcovers in his Charity any imperfection, muſt not believe that he hath any true Faith. Theſe you ſee are ſtrange and portentous conſequences, and yet the deduction of them from your Doctrine is clear and apparent; which ſhews this Doctrine of yours, which you would fain have true, that there might be ſome neceſſity of your Churches Infallibility, to be indeed plainly repugnant not only to Truth but even to all Religion and Piety, and fit for nothing but to make men negligent of making any Progreſs in Faith or Charity.

5. As for that one ſingle reaſon which you produce to confirm it, it will appear upon examination to be reſolved finally into a groundleſs Aſſertion of your own, contrary to all Truth and experience, and that is, *That no degree of Faith, leſs than a moſt certain and infallible knowledge, can be able ſufficiently to overbear our will and encounter with humane probabilities, being backt with the ſtrength of Fleſh and Blood.* For who ſees not that many Millions in the World forgoe many times their preſent eaſe and pleaſure, undergo great and toilſom labours, encounter great difficulties, adventure upon great dangers, and all this not upon any certain expectation, but upon a probable hope of ſome future gain and commodity, and that not infinite and Eternal, but finite and temporal? Who ſees not that many men abſtain from many things they exceedingly deſire, not upon any certain aſſurance, but a probable fear of danger that may come after? What man ever was there ſo madly in love with a preſent penny, but that he would willingly ſpend it upon any little hope, that by doing ſo he might gain an hundred thouſand pound? And I would fain know *what gay probabilities* you could deviſe to diſſuade him from this Reſolution. And if you can deviſe none, what reaſon then, or ſenſe is there, but that

a probable hope of infinite and Eternal Happiness, provided for all those that obey *Christ Jesus*, and much more a firm Faith, though not so certain, in some sort, as sense or science, may be able to sway our will to obedience, and encounter with all those temptations which Flesh and Blood can suggest to avert us from it? Men may therefore talk their pleasure of an absolute and most infallible certainty, but did they generally believe that obedience to Christ were the only way to present and eternal felicity, but as firmly and undoubtedly as that there is such a City as *Constantinople*, nay but as much as *Cæsars* Commentaries, or the History of *Sallust*, I believe the lives of most men, both *Papists* and *Protestants* would be better than they are. Thus therefore out of your own Words I argue against you: He that requires to true Faith, an absolute and infallible certainty, for this only Reason, *because any less degree could not be able to overbear our will*, &c. imports, that if a less degree of Faith were able to do this, then a less degree of Faith may be true and Divine and saving Faith: But experience shews, and reason confirms, that a firm Faith, though not so certain as sense or science, may be able to encounter and overcome our will and affections: And therefore it follows from your own reason, that Faith which is not a most certain and infallible knowledge may be true and Divine and saving Faith.

6. All these Reasons I have employed to shew that such a most certain and infallible Faith as here you talk of, is not so necessary, but that without such a high degree of it, it is possible to please God. And therefore the Doctrines delivered by you §. 25. are most presumptuous and uncharitable: viz. *That such a most certain and Infallible Faith is necessary to Salvation, necessitate Finis, or Medii*, so necessary, that *after a man is come to the use of reason, no man ever was or can be saved without it.* Wherein you boldly intrude into the judgment seat of God, and damn men for breaking Laws not of Gods, but your own making. But withal, you clearly contradict your self, not only where you affirm, *That your Faith depends finally upon the Tradition of Age to Age, of Father to Son*, which cannot be a fit ground, but

but only for a Moral Assurance; nor only, where you pretend, that *not alone Hearing and Seeing*, but also *Histories, Letters, Relations of many* (which certainly are things not certain and infallible,) *are yet Foundations good enough to support your Faith*; Which Doctrine, if it were good and allowable, *Protestants* might then hope that their Histories and Letters and Relations might also pass for means sufficient of a sufficient Certainty, and that they should not be excluded from Salvation for want of such a Certainty. But indeed the pressure of the present difficulty compelled you to speak here, what I believe you will not justifie, and with a pretty tergiversation to shew D. *Potter* your means of moral certainty; whereas the Objection was that you had no means or possibility of infallible certainty, for which you are plainly at as great a loss and as far to seek as any of your Adversaries. And therefore it concerns you highly not to damn others for want of it, lest you involve your selves in the same condemnation; according to those terrible Words of S. *Paul, Inexcusabilis es*, &c. In this therefore you plainly contradict your self. And lastly most plainly, in saying as you do here, you contradict and retract your pretence of Charity to *Protestants* in the beginning of your Book: For there you make profession, that *you have no assurance but that* Protestants *dying* Protestants, *may possibly die with contrition, and be saved:* And here you are very Peremptory, that *they cannot but want a means absolutely necessary to Salvation, and wanting that cannot but be damned.*

7. The third Condition you require to Faith, is, that our assent to Divine Truths should *not only be unknown and unevident by any humane discourse*, but that *absolutely also it should be obscure in it self, and ordinarily speaking, be void even of supernatural evidence.* Which words must have a very favourable construction, or else they will not be sense. For who can make any thing of these words taken properly, that *Faith must be an unknown unevident assent, or an assent absolutely obscure?* I had always thought that known and unknown, obscure and evident had been affections, not of our Assent, but the Object of it, not of

our belief, but the thing believed. For well may we aſſent to a thing unknown, obſcure, or unevident; but that our aſſent it ſelf ſhould be called therefore unknown or obſcure, ſeems to me as great an impropriety, as if I ſhould ſay, your ſight were green or blew, becauſe you ſee ſomething that is ſo. In other places therefore I anſwer your words, but here I muſt anſwer your meaning: which I conceive to be, That it is neceſſary to Faith that the Objects of it, the points which we believe ſhould not be ſo evidently certain, as to neceſſitate our underſtandings to an Aſſent, that ſo their might be ſome merit in Faith, as you love to ſpeak (who will not receive no not from God himſelf, but a penny-worth for a penny,) but as we, ſome obedience in it, which can hardly have place where there is no poſſibility of diſobedience, as there is not where the underſtanding does all, and the will nothing. Now ſeeing the Religion of *Proteſtants*, though it be much more credible than yours, yet is not pretended to have the abſolute evidence of ſenſe or demonſtration; therefore I might let this Doctrine paſs without exception, for any prejudice that can redound to us by it. But yet I muſt not forbear to tell you, that your diſcourſe proves indeed this condition requiſite to the merit, but yet not to the eſſence of Faith: without it Faith were not an act of obedience, but yet Faith may be Faith without it; and this you muſt confeſs, unleſs you will ſay either the Apoſtles believed not the whole Goſpel which they preached, or that they were not eye-witneſſes of a great part of it: unleſs you will queſtion S. *John* for ſaying *that which we have ſeen with our Eyes, and which our hands have handled*, &c. *declare we unto you:* nay our Saviour himſelf for ſaying, Thomas *becauſe thou ſeeſt thou believeſt, Bleſſed are they which have not ſeen and yet have believed.* Yet if you will ſay that in reſpect of the things which they ſaw, the Apoſtles aſſent was not pure and proper and meer Faith, but ſomewhat more; an aſſent containing Faith but ſuperadding to it, I will not contend with you, for it will be a contention about words. But then again I muſt crave leave to tell you,

that

that the requiring this condition, is in my judgment a plain revocation of the former. For had you made the matter of Faith either naturally or ſupernaturally evident, it might have been a fitly attempered and duly proportioned object for an abſolute certainty natural or ſupernatural: But requiring as you do, *that Faith ſhould be an abſolute knowledge of a thing not abſolutely known, an infallible certainty of a thing which though it is in it ſelf, yet is it not made appear to us to be infallibly certain,* to my underſtanding you ſpeak impoſſibilities. And truly for one of your Religion to do ſo, is but a good *Decorum.* For the matter and object of your Faith being ſo full of contradictions, a contradictious Faith may very well become a contradictious Religion. Your Faith therefore, if you pleaſe to have it ſo, let it be a free, neceſſitated, certain, uncertain, evident, obſcure, prudent and fooliſh, natural and ſupernatural unnatural aſſent. But they which are unwilling to believe nonſenſe themſelves, or to perſuade others to do ſo, it is but reaſon they ſhould make the Faith wherewith they believe, an intelligible, compoſſible, conſiſtent thing, and not define it by repugnances. Now nothing is more repugnant, than that a man ſhould be required to give moſt certain credit unto that which cannot be made apppear moſt certainly credible: and if it appear to him to be ſo, then is it not obſcure that it is ſo. For if you ſpeak of an acquired, rational, diſcurſive Faith, certainly theſe Reaſons which make the object ſeem credible, muſt be the cauſe of it, and conſequently the ſtrength and firmity of my aſſent muſt riſe and fall together with the apparent credibility of the object. If you ſpeak of a ſupernatural infuſed Faith, then you either ſuppoſe it infuſed by the former means, and then that which was ſaid before muſt be ſaid again: for whatſoever effect is wrought meerly by means, muſt bear proportion to, and cannot exceed the vertue of the means, by which it is wrought: As nothing by water can be made more cold than water, nor by fire more hot than fire, nor by honey more ſweet than honey, nor by gall more bitter than gall: Or if you will ſuppoſe it infuſed without

out means, then that power which infuſeth into the underſtanding aſſent which bears Analogy to ſight in the eye, muſt alſo infuſe evidence, that is, Viſibility into the Object: and look what degree of aſſent is infuſed into the underſtanding, at leaſt the ſame degree of evidence muſt be infuſed into the Object. And for you to require a ſtrength of credit beyond the appearance of the Objects credibility, is all one as if you ſhould require me to go Ten Miles an hour upon a Horſe that will go but five: to diſcern a man certainly through a miſt or cloud that makes him not certainly diſcernable; To hear a ſound more clearly than it is audible; to underſtand a thing more fully than it is intelligible: and he that doth ſo, I may well expect that his next injunction will be, that I muſt ſee ſomething that is inviſible, hear ſomething inaudible, underſtand ſomething that is wholly unintelligible. For he that demands ten of me, knowing I have but five, does in effect, as if he demanded five, knowing that I have none: and by like reaſon, you requiring that I ſhould ſee things farther than they are viſible, require I ſhould ſee ſomething inviſible, and in requiring that I believe ſomething more firmly than it is made to me evidently credible, you require in effect that I believe ſomething which appears to me incredible, and while it does ſo. I deny not but that I am bound to believe the truth of many Texts of Scripture the ſenſe whereof is to me obſcure and the Truth of many Articles of Faith the manner whereof is obſcure, and to humane underſtandings incomprehenſible; But then it is to be obſerved, that not the ſenſe of ſuch Texts, not the manner of theſe things is that which I am bound to believe, but the truth of them. But that I ſhould believe the Truth of any thing, the truth whereof cannot be made evident with an evidence proportionable to the degree of Faith required of me, this I ſay for any man to be bound to, is unjuſt and unreaſonable, becauſe to do it is impoſſible.

8. Ad §. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12.] Yet though I deny that it is required of us to be certain in the higheſt degree, infallibly

infallibly certain of the truth of the things which we believe, for this were to know and not believe, neither is it possible unless our evidence of it, be it natural or supernatural, were of the highest degree; yet I deny not but that we are to believe the Religion of Christ, we are and may be infallibly certain. For first, this is most certain, that we are in all things to do according to wisdom and reason rather than against it. Secondly, this is as certain, That wisdom and reason require that we should believe these things which are by many degrees more credible and probable than the contrary. Thirdly, this is as certain, that to every man who considers impartially what great things may be said for the truth of Christianity, and what poor things they are which may be said against it, either for any other Religion or for none at all, it cannot but appear by many degrees more credible, that Christian Religion, is true than the contrary. And from all these premises, this conclusion evidently follows, that it is infallibly certain, that we are firmly to believe the truth of Christian Religion.

9. Your discourse therefore touching the fourth requisite to Faith which is Prudence, I admit so far as to grant. 1. That if we were required to believe with certainty (I mean a Moral certainty,) things no way represented as infallible and certain, (I mean Morally,) an unreasonable obedience were required of us. And so likewise were it, were we required to believe as absolutely certain, that which is no way represented to us as absolutely certain. 2. That whom God obligeth to believe any thing, he will not fail to furnish their understandings with such inducements, as are sufficient (if they be not negligent or perverse) to persuade them to believe. 3. That there is an abundance of Arguments exceedingly credible, inducing men to believe the Truth of Christianity: I say so credibile, that though they cannot make us evidently see what we believe, yet they evidently convince that in true Wisdom and Prudence, the Articles of it deserve credit, and ought to be accepted as things revealed by God. 4. That without such reasons and inducements, our choice even of the true Faith, is not to be commended

mended as prudent, but to be condemned of raſhneſs and levity.

10. But then for your making Prudence, not only a commendation of a believer, and a juſtification of his Faith, but alſo eſſential to it, and part of the definition of it, in that, queſtionleſs you were miſtaken, and have done as if being to ſay what a man is, you ſhould define him, A Reaſonable creature that hath skill in Aſtronomy. For as all Aſtronomers are men, but all men are not Aſtronomers, and therefore Aſtronomy ought not to be put into the definition of men, where nothing ſhould have place, but what agrees to all men: So though all that are truly wiſe (that is, wiſe for Eternity,) will believe aright, yet many may believe aright which are not wiſe. I could wiſh with all my Heart as *Moſes* did, *that all the Lords People could Propheſie*: That all that believe the true Religion *were able* (according to S. *Peters* injunction) *to give a reaſon of the hope that is in them*, a reaſon why they hope for Eternal Happineſs by this way rather than any other! neither do I think it any great difficulty that men of ordinary capacities, if they would give their mind to it, might quickly be enabled to do ſo. But ſhould I affirm that all true believers can do ſo, I ſuppoſe it would be as much againſt experience and modeſty, as it is againſt Truth and Charity, to ſay as you do, that *they which cannot do ſo, either are not at all, or to no purpoſe true believers.* And thus we ſee that the foundations you build upon, are ruinous and deceitful, and ſo unfit to ſupport your Fabrick that they deſtroy one another. I come now to ſhew that your Arguments to prove *Proteſtants Hereticks* are all of the ſame quality with your former grounds: which I will do by oppoſing clear and ſatisfying Anſwers in order to them.

11. Ad §. 13.) To the firſt then, delivered by you §. 13. *That* Proteſtants *muſt be* Hereticks, *becauſe they oppoſed divers Truths propounded for Divine by the Viſible Church*: I Anſwer, It is not *Hereſie* to oppoſe any Truth propounded by the Church, but only ſuch a Truth as is an eſſential part of the Goſpel of Chriſt. 2. The Doctrines which *Proteſtants* oppoſed, were not Truths, but plain

plain and impious falſhoods: Neither thirdly, were they propounded as Truths by the Viſible Church, but only by a Part of it, and that a corrupted Part.

12. Ad §. 14. The next *Argument, in the next Particle tells us,* That *every error againſt any doctrin revealed by God is damnable Hereſie: Now either Proteſtants or the* Roman *Church muſt err againſt the word of God: But the* Roman *Church* we *grant (perforce) doth not err damnably, neither can ſhe, becauſe ſhe is the Catholick Church, which* we (you ſay) *confeſs cannot err damnably: Therefore Proteſtants muſt err againſt Gods word, and conſequently are guilty of formal Hereſie.* Whereunto I anſwer plainly, that there be in this argument almoſt as many falſhoods as aſſertions. For neither is every error againſt any Doctrin revealed by God a damnable Hereſie, unleſs it be revealed publickly, and plainly with a command that all ſhould believe it. 2. D. *Potter* no where grants, that the Errors of the *Roman* Church are *not in themſelves damnable,* though he hopes by accident they may not actually damn ſome men amongſt you: and this you your ſelf confeſs in divers places of your book, where you tell us, that he *allows no hope of Salvation to thoſe amongſt you, whom ignorance cannot excuſe.* 3. You beg the Queſtion twice in taking for granted, Firſt that *the* Roman *Church is the truly Catholick Church*; which without much favour can hardly paſs for a part of it: And again, that the *Catholick Church cannot fall into any error of it ſelf damnable:* for it may do ſo, and ſtill be the Catholick Church, if it retain thoſe Truths which may be an antidote againſt the malignity of this error, to thoſe that held it out of a ſimple un-affected ignorance. Laſtly, though the thing be true, yet I might well require ſome proof of it from you, that either *Proteſtants* or the *Roman* Church muſt err againſt Gods word. For if their contradiction be your only reaſon, then alſo you or the *Dominicans* muſt be *Hereticks,* becauſe you contradict one another as much as *Proteſtants* and *Papiſts.*

13. Ad §. 15. The third Argument pretends that *you have ſhewed already, that the Viſible Church is Judge of Controverſies, and therefore Infallible; from whence you ſuppoſe that*

it follows, that to oppoſe her, is to oppoſe God. To which I anſwer, that you have ſaid onely, and not ſhewed that *the Viſible Church is Judge of Controverſies.* And indeed how can ſhe be judge of them if ſhe cannot decide them? And how can ſhe decide them, if it be a queſtion whether ſhe be judge of them? That which is queſtioned it ſelf, cannot with any ſenſe be pretended to be fit to decide other queſtions; and much leſs this queſtion, whether it have Authority to judge and decide all queſtions? 2. If ſhe were judge, it would not follow that ſhe were infallible, for we have many Judges in our Courts of Judicature, yet none infallible. Nay you cannot with any modeſty deny, that every man in the world ought to judge for himſelf, what Religion is trueſt, and yet you will not ſay that every man is infallible. 3. If the Church were ſuppoſed Infallible, yet it would not follow at all, much leſs manifeſtly, that to oppoſe her declaration is to oppoſe God: unleſs you ſuppoſe alſo that as ſhe is infallible, ſo by her oppoſers, ſhe is known or believed to be ſo. Laſtly, If all this were true (as it is all moſt falſe) yet were it to little purpoſe, ſeeing you have omitted to prove that the Viſible Church is the *Roman.*

14. Ad §. 16. Inſtead of a fourth Argument this is preſented to us, *That if* Luther *were an Heretick, then they that agreed with him muſt be ſo.* And that *Luther* was a formal Heretick, you endeavor to prove by this moſt formal Syllogiſm; *To ſay the Viſible Church is not Univerſal, is properly an Hereſie: but* Luthers *Reformation was not Univerſal, Therefore it cannot be excuſed from formal Hereſie.* Whereunto I Anſwer, firſt to the firſt part, that it is no way impoſſible that *Luther,* had he been the inventer and firſt broacher of a falſe Doctrin, (as he was not) might have been a formal Heretick, and yet that thoſe who follow him may be only ſo materially and improperly, and indeed no Hereticks. Your own men out of S. *Auguſtin* diſtinguiſh between *Hæretici & Hæreticorum ſequaces*: And you your ſelf though you pronounce *the leaders among the* Arrians *formal Hereticks,* yet confeſs that *Salvian* was at leaſt doubtful whether theſe *Arrians,* who in ſimplicity followed

ed their Teachers, might not be excuſed by ignorance. And about this ſuſpenſion of his you alſo ſeem ſuſpended, for you neither approve nor condemn it. Secondly, to the ſecond part I ſay, that had you not preſumed upon our ignorance in Logick as well as Metaphyſicks and School Divinity, you would never have obtruded upon us this rope of ſand for a formal Syllogiſm. It is even Couſin-German to this, To deny the Reſurrection is properly an Hereſie, But *Luthers* Reformation was not Univerſal, Therefore it cannot be excuſed from formal Hereſie! Or to this, To ſay the Viſible Church is not Univerſal is properly an Hereſie: But the preaching of the Goſpel at the beginning was not Univerſal; therefore it cannot be excuſed from formal Hereſie. For as he whoſe Reformation is but particular, may yet not deny the Reſurrection, ſo may he alſo not deny the Churches Univerſality. And as the Apoſtles who preached the Goſpel in the beginning, did believe the Church Univerſal, though their preaching at the beginning was not ſo: So *Luther* alſo might and did believe the Church Univerſal, though his Reformation were but particular. I ſay he did believe it Univerſal, even in your own ſenſe, that is, Univerſal *de jure*, though not *de facto*. And as for univerſality in fact, he believed the Church much more Univerſal than his Reformation: For he did conceive (as appears by your own Allegations out of him) that only the Part reformed was the true Church, but alſo that they were Part of it who needed reformation. Neither did he ever pretend to make a new Church but to reform the old one. Thirdly and laſtly, to the firſt propoſition of this unſyllogiſtical ſyllogiſm, I anſwer, That to ſay the true Church is not always *de facto* univerſal, is ſo far from being an Hereſie, that it is a certain Truth known to all thoſe that know the world, and what Religions poſſeſs far the greater part of it. *Donatus* therefore was not to blame, for ſaying, that the Church might poſſibly be confined to *Africk*; but for ſaying without ground, that then it was ſo. And S. *Auſtin*, as he was in the right, in thinking that the Church was then extended farther than *Africk*; ſo was he in the wrong if he thought that

of neceſſity it always muſt be ſo; but moſt palpably miſtaken in conceiving that it was then ſpread over the whole earth, and known to all nations, which if paſſion did not trouble you, and make you forget how lately almoſt half the world was diſcovered, and in what eſtate it was then found, you would very eaſily ſee and confeſs.

16. *The* Donatiſts *might do ill in calling the Chair of* Rome *the Chair of Peſtilence, and the* Roman *Church an Harlot,* and yet the ſtate of the Church being altered, *Proteſtants* might do well to do ſo, and therefore though, *S.* Auſtin *might perhaps have reaſon to perſecute the* Donatiſts *for detracting from the Church,* and calling her Harlot, when ſhe was not ſo; yet you may have none to threaten D. *Potter* that you would perſecute him (as the Application of this place intimates you would,) if it were in your power: plainly ſhewing that you are a curſt Cow though your horns be ſhort, ſeeing the *Roman* Church is not now what it was in S. *Auſtins* time. And hereof the concluſion of your own book affords us a very pregnant teſtimony: where you tell us out of Saint *Auſtin,* that one grand impediment, which among many kept the ſeduced followers of the faction of *Donatus* from the Churches Communion, was a viſible calumny raiſed againſt the Catholicks, that *they did ſet ſome ſtrange thing upon their Altar. To how many* (ſaith Saint *Auſtin) did the reports of ill Tongues ſhut up the way to enter, who ſaid, that we put, I know not what upon the Altar?* Out of deteſtation of the calumny, and juſt indignation againſt it, he would not ſo much as name the impiety wherewith they were charged, and therefore by a Rhetorical figure calls it, *I know not what.* But compare with him *Optatus,* writing of the ſame matter, and you ſhall plainly perceive that this *(I know not what)* pretended to be ſet upon the Altar, was indeed a picture, which the *Donatiſts* (knowing how deteſtable a thing it was to all Chriſtians at that time, to ſet up any pictures in a Church to worſhip them, as your new faſhion is) bruited abroad to be done in the Churches of the Catholick Church. But what anſwer do S. *Auſtin* and *Optatus* make

make to this accuſation? Do they confeſs and maintain it? Do they ſay, as you would now, It is true we do ſet Pictures upon our Altar, and that not only for ornament or memory, but for worſhip alſo; but we do well to do ſo, and this ought not to trouble you, or affright you from our Communion? What other anſwer your Church could now make to ſuch an objection, is very hard to imagine: And therefore were your Doctrin the ſame with the Doctrin of the Fathers in this point, they muſt have anſwered ſo likewiſe. But they to the contrary not only deny the crime, but abhor and deteſt it. To little purpoſe therefore do you hunt after theſe poor ſhadows of reſemblances between us and the *Donatiſts*: unleſs you could ſhew an exact reſemblance between the preſent Church of *Rome* and the Ancient: which ſeeing by this, and many other particulars it is demonſtrated to be impoſſible; that Church which was then a Virgin may be now a Harlot, and that which was detraction in the *Donatiſts*, may be in *Proteſtants* a juſt accuſation.

18. But the main point you ſay is, that *ſince* Luthers *Reformed Church was not in being for divers Centuries before* Luther, *and yet was in the Apoſtles time, they muſt of neceſſity affirm heretically with the* Donatiſts, *that the true unſpotted Church of Chriſt periſhed, and that ſhe which remained on earth, was (O Blaſphemy!) an Harlot.* By which words it ſeems you are reſolute perpetually to confound *True* and *Unſpotted*; and to put no difference between a corrupted Church and none at all. But what is this, but to make no difference between a diſeaſed and a dead man? Nay what is it but to contradict your ſelves, who cannot deny but that ſins are as great ſtains and ſpots and deformities in the ſight of God, as errors; and confeſs your Church to be a Congregation of men, whereof every particular, not one excepted, (and conſequently the generality which is nothing but a collection of them) is polluted and defiled with ſin?

19. You ask, How *can the Church more truly be ſaid to periſh, than when ſhe is permitted to maintain a damnable Hereſie?* I Anſwer, ſhe may be more truly ſaid to periſh, when ſhe

ſhe is not only permitted to do ſo, but *de facto* doth maintain a damnable Hereſie. Again, ſhe may be more truly ſaid to periſh, when ſhe falls into an Hereſie, which is not only damnable in it ſelf, and *ex natura rei*, as you ſpeak, but ſuch an Hereſie, the belief of whoſe contrary Truth is neceſſary, not only *neceſſitate præcepti* but *medii*, and therefore the Hereſie ſo abſolutely and indiſpenſably deſtructive of ſalvation, that no ignorance can excuſe it, nor any general repentance, without a dereliction of it, can beg a pardon for it. Such an hereſie if the Church ſhould fall into, it might be more truly ſaid to periſh, than if it fell only into ſome hereſie of its own nature damnable. For in that ſtate all the members of it, without exception, all without mercy muſt needs periſh for ever: In this, although thoſe that might ſee the truth and would not, cannot upon any good ground hope for ſalvation, yet without queſtion, it might ſend many ſouls to heaven, who would gladly have embraced the Truth, but that they wanted means to diſcover it. Thirdly and laſtly, ſhe may yet more truly be ſaid to periſh when ſhe Apoſtates from Chriſt abſolutely, or rejects even thoſe Truths out of which her Hereſies may be reformed; as if ſhe ſhould directly deny *Jeſus to be the Chriſt*, or the Scripture to be the Word of God. Towards which ſtate of Perdition it may well be feared that the Church of *Rome* doth ſomewhat incline, by her ſuperinducing upon the reſt of her Errors the Doctrin of her own Infallibility, whereby her errors are made incurable; and by her pretending that the Scripture is to be interpreted according to her doctrin, and not her doctrin to be judged of by Scripture, whereby ſhe makes the Scripture uneffectuall for her Reformation.

20. Ad §. 18. I was very glad when I heard you ſay *The Holy Scripture and ancient Fathers do aſſign Separation from the Viſible Church as a mark of Hereſie:* for I was in good hope, that no Chriſtian would ſo belie the Scripture, as to ſay ſo of it, unleſs he could have produced ſome one Text at leaſt, wherein this was plainly affirmed, or from whence it might be undoubtedly and undeniably collected. For aſſure your ſelf, good Sir, it is a very heinous crime

to

to ſay, *thus ſaith the Lord, when the Lord doth not ſay ſo.* I expected therefore ſome Scripture ſhould have been alledged, wherein it ſhould have been ſaid, *whoſoever ſeparates from the* Roman *Church is an Heretick*: or *the* Roman *Church is infallible,* or *the guide of Faith*: or at leaſt, *There ſhall be always ſome Viſible Church infallible in matters of Faith.* Some ſuch direction as this I hoped for: And I pray conſider whether I had not reaſon! The Evangeliſts and Apoſtles who wrote the New Teſtament, we all ſuppoſe were good men, and very deſirous to direct us the ſureſt and plaineſt way to Heaven; we ſuppoſe them likewiſe very ſufficiently inſtructed by the Spirit of God in all the neceſſary points of the Chriſtian Faith, and therefore certainly not ignorant of this *Unum Neceſſarium,* this moſt neceſſary point of all others, without which as you pretend and teach, all faith is no Faith, that is, that *the Church of* Rome *was deſigned by God the guide of Faith.* We ſuppoſe them laſtly wiſe men, eſpecially being aſſiſted by the ſpirit of wiſdom, and ſuch as knew that a doubtful and queſtionable guide was for mens direction as good as none at all. And after all theſe ſuppoſitions, which I preſume no good Chriſtian will call into queſtion, is it poſſible that any Chriſtian heart can believe, that not one amongſt them all ſhould *ad rei memoriam* write this neceſſary doctrin plainly ſo much as once? Certainly in all reaſon they had provided much better for the good of Chriſtians if they had wrote this, though they had writ nothing elſe. Methinks the Evangeliſts undertaking to write the Goſpel of Chriſt, could not poſſibly have omitted, any one of them, this moſt neceſſary point of faith, had they known it neceſſary, (S. *Luke* eſpecially, who plainly profeſſeth that *his intent was to write all things neceſſary.*) Methinks S. *Paul* writing to the *Romans* could not but have congratulated this their Priviledge to them! Methinks inſtead of ſaying, *Your Faith is ſpoken of all the world over* (which you have no reaſon to be very proud of, for he ſays the very ſame thing to the *Theſſalonians,*) he could not have failed to have told them once at leaſt in plain terms, that *their Faith was the Rule for all the World for ever.* But then ſure he would have forborn to put them

in

in fear of an impoſſibility, as he doth in his eleventh Chap. that they alſo, nay the whole Church of the *Gentiles if they did not look to their ſtanding, might fall away to infidelity* as the *Jews* had done. Methinks in all his other Epiſtles, at leaſt in ſome, at leaſt in one of them, he could not have failed to have given the world this direction, had he known it to be a true one, that *all men were to be guided by the Church of* Rome, *and none to ſeparate from it under pain of damnation.* Methinks writing ſo often of Hereticks and Antichriſt, he ſhould have given the world this (as you pretend) only ſure preſervative from them. How was it poſſible that S. *Peter* writing two Catholick Epiſtles, mentioning his own departure, writing to preſerve Chriſtians in the Faith, ſhould in neither of them commend them to the guidance of his pretended Succeſſors, the Biſhops of *Rome?* How was it poſſible that S. *James,* and S. *Jude* in their Catholick Epiſtles ſhould not give this Catholick direction? Methinks S. *John* inſtead of ſaying, *he that believeth that Jeſus is the Chriſt, is born of God,* (The force of which direction, your gloſſes do quite enervate, and make unavailable to diſcern who are the ſons of God,) ſhould have ſaid, *He that adheres to the doctrin of the* Roman *Church, and lives according to it, he is a good Chriſtian, and by this Mark ye ſhall know him!* What man not quite out of his wits, if he conſider as he ſhould, the pretended neceſſity of this doctrin, that without the belief hereof no man ordinarily can be ſaved, can poſſibly force himſelf to conceive that all theſe good and holy men, ſo deſirous of mens ſalvation, and ſo well aſſured of it (as it is pretended,) ſhould be ſo deeply and affectedly ſilent in it, and not one ſay it plainly ſo much as once, but leave it to be collected from uncertain principles, by many more uncertain conſequences? Certainly he that can judge ſo uncharitably of them, it is no marvel if he cenſure other inferior ſervants of Chriſt as Atheiſts, and Hypocrites, and what he pleaſes. Plain places therefore I did and had reaſon to look for, when I heard you ſay, *the holy Scripture aſſigns Separation from the viſible Church as a mark of Hereſie.* But inſtead hereof what have

have you brought us, but meer impertinences? S. *John* ſaith of ſome who pretended to be Chriſtians and were not ſo, and therefore when it was for their advantage forſook their Profeſſion, *They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us.* Of ſome, who before the decree of the Council to the contrary, were perſuaded and accordingly taught, that the convert Gentiles were to keep the Law of *Moſes*, it is ſaid in the *Acts*, *Some who went out from us.* And again S. *Paul* in the ſame Book forewarns the *Epheſians* that *out of them ſhould ariſe men ſpeaking perverſe things.* And from theſe places which it ſeems are the plaineſt you have, you collect *that ſeparation from the Viſible Church is aſſigned by Scripture as a Mark of* Hereſie. Which is certainly a ſtrange and unheard of ſtrain of Logick. Unleſs you will ſay that every Text wherein it is ſaid, that ſome Body goes out from ſome Body, affords an Argument for this purpoſe! For the firſt place there is no certainty that it ſpeaks of *Hereticks*, but, *no Chriſtians*, of *Antichriſts*, *of ſuch as denied Jeſus to be the Chriſt*: See the place and you ſhall confeſs as much. The ſecond place, it is certain, you muſt not ſay it ſpeaks of *Hereticks*, for it ſpeaks only of ſome who believed and taught an Error, while it was yet a queſtion and not evident, and therefore according to your Doctrine, no formal *Hereſie*. The third ſays indeed, that of the Profeſſors of Chriſtianity, ſome ſhall ariſe that ſhall teach *Hereſie*: But not one of them all that ſays or intimates, that whoſoever ſeparates from the Viſible Church, in what ſtate ſoever, is certainly an *Heretick*. *Hereticks* I confeſs do always do ſo; But they that do ſo are not always *Hereticks*, for perhaps the State of the Church may make it neceſſary for them to do ſo; as Rebels always diſobey the command of their King, yet they which diſobey a Kings Command (which perhaps may be unjuſt) are not preſently Rebels.

22. In the 19. §. We have the Authority of eight Fathers urged to prove *that the ſeparation from the Church of* Rome *as it is the Sea of S.* Peter (I conceive you mean as it is the Particular Church) *is the mark of* Hereſie. Which kind of Argument I might well refuſe to anſwer,

unleſs you would firſt promiſe me, that whenſoever I ſhould produce as plain ſentences, of as great a number of Fathers, as Ancient, for any Doctrine whatſoever, that you will ſubſcribe to it, though it fall out to be contrary to the Doctrine of the *Roman* Church. For I conceive nothing in the World more unequal or unreaſonable, than that you ſhould preſs us with ſuch Authorities as theſe, and think your ſelves at liberty from them; and that you ſhould account them Fathers when they are for you, and Children when they are againſt you. Yet I would not you ſhould interpret this as if I had not great aſſurance, that it is not poſſible for you ever to gain this cauſe at the Tribunal of the Fathers, nay not of the Fathers whoſe ſentences are here alledged. Let us conſider them in order, and I doubt not to make it appear that far the greater part of them, nay all of them that are any way conſiderable fall ſhort of your purpoſe.

23. Obj. S. *Hierome* (you ſay Ep. 57. ad *Damaſum*) profeſſes, *I am in the Communion of the Chair of* Peter, *&c.* But then I pray conſider he ſaith it to *Pope Damaſus*: and this will much weaken the Authority, with them who know how great over-truths men uſually write to one another in letters. Conſider again, that he ſays only, that *he was then in Communion with the Chair of* Peter, Not that he always would, or of neceſſity muſt be ſo: for his reſolution to the contrary is too evident out of that which he ſaith elſwhere which ſhall be produced hereafter. He ſays that the *Church at that preſent was built upon that Rock*; but not that only, Nor that alwaies. Nay his judgment as ſhall appear is expreſs to the contrary. And ſo likewiſe the reſt of his expreſſions (if we mean to reconcile *Hierome* with *Hierome*) muſt be conceived as intended by him, of that Biſhop and Sea of *Rome*, at that preſent time, and in the preſent State, and in reſpect of that Doctrine which he there intreats of. For otherwiſe had he conceived it neceſſary for him and all men to conform their judgments in matters of Faith, to the judgment of the Biſhop and Church of *Rome*, how came it to paſs that he choſe rather to believe the Epiſtle to the

Hebrews

Hebrews Canonical, upon the Authority of the Eastern Church, than to reject it from the Canon upon the Authority of the *Roman*? How comes it to pass that he dissented from the Authority of that Church, touching the Canon of the *Old Testament*? For if you say, that the Church, then consented with S. *Hierome*, I fear you will lose your Fort by maintaining your Out-works, and by avoiding this, run into a greater danger of being forced to confess the present *Roman* Church opposite herein to the Ancient. How was it possible, that he should ever believe that *Liberius* Bishop of *Rome* either was or could have been wrought over by *the sollicitation of Fortunatianus Bishop of Aquileia, and brought after two Years Banishment to subscribe* Heresie? Which Act of *Liberius* though some fondly question, being so vain as to expect we should rather believe them that lived but yesterday, thirteen hundred Years almost after the thing is said to be done, and speaking for themselves in their own Cause, rather than the dis-interessed time-fellows or immediate Successors of *Liberius* himself: yet I hope they will not proceed to such a degree of immodesty, as once to question whether S. *Hierome* thought so. And if this cannot be denied, I demand then if he had lived in *Liberius* his time, could he or would he have written so to *Liberius* as he does to *Damasus*? would he have said to him, *I am in the Communion of the Chair of* Peter, *I know that the Church is built upon this Rock, Whosoever gathereth not with thee scattereth.* Would he then have said, the *Roman* Faith and the *Catholick* were the same: or, that the *Roman* Faith received no delusions, no not from an Angel? I suppose he could not have said so with any coherence to his own belief; and therefore conceive it undeniable that what he said then to *Damasus*, he said it (though perhaps he strained too high) only of *Damasus*, and never conceived that his words would have been extended to all his Predecessors and all his Successors.

Hierom. de script. Eccle. tit. Fortunatianus.

24. Obj. S. *Ambrose* (de obitu Satyri fratris) *saith* of his Brother *Satyrus*, that *inquiring for a Church wherein to give thanks for his delivery from Shipwreck, he called to him the*

Biſhop, and he asked him whether he agreed with the Catholick Biſhops, that is, *with the* Roman *Church? And when he underſtood that he was a Schiſmatick,* that is, *Separated from the* Roman *Church, he abſtained from Communicating with him.*

Anſw. No more can be certainly concluded from it, but that the *Catholick* Biſhops and the *Roman* Church were then at Unity; ſo that whoſoever agreed with the latter could not then but agree with the former. But that this Rule was perpetual, and that no man could ever agree with the *Catholick* Biſhops, but he muſt agree with the *Roman* Church, this he ſays not, nor gives you any ground to conclude from him. *Athanaſius* when he was excommunicated by *Liberius*, agreed very ill with the *Roman* Church, and yet you will not gainſay, but he agreed well enough with the *Catholick* Biſhops.

24. Obj. S. *Cyprian ſaith* (*Epiſt.* 55. *ad Cornel.*) They are bold to Sail to the *Chair of S.* Peter, *and to the principal Church, from whence Prieſtly Unity hath ſprung. Neither do they conſider that they are* Romans, *whoſe Faith was commended by the Preaching of the Apoſtle, to whom falſhood cannot have acceſs.*

b It is confeſſed by *Baronius Anno.* 238. N. 41. By *Bellarm. l.* 4. *de R. Pont. c.* 7. §. *Tertia ratio.*

Anſw. For S. *Cyprian* all the World knows that he [b] reſolutely oppoſed a Decree of the *Roman* Biſhop, and all that adhered to him in the point of Re-baptizing, which that Church at that time delivered as a neceſſary tradition. So neceſſary, that by the Biſhop of *Rome Firmilianus* and other Biſhops of *Cappadocia*, *Cilicia* and *Galatia*, and generally all who perſiſted in the contrary opinion, [c] were therefore deprived of the Churches Communion, (which excommunication could not but involve S. *Cyprian*, who defended the ſame opinion as reſolutely as *Firmilianus*, though Cardinal *Perren* magiſterially and without all colour of proof affirm the contrary,) and *Cyprian* in particular ſo far caſt off, as for it to be pronounced by *Stephen a falſe Chriſt.* Again ſo neceſſary that the Biſhops which were ſent by *Cyprian* from *Africk* to *Rome*, were not admitted to the Communion of ordinary conference: But all men who were ſubject to the Biſhop of *Romes* Authority, were commanded by him not only to deny them the

c Confeſſed by *Baronius An.* 258. N. 14. & 15. By *Card. Perron.* Repl. *l.* 1. *c.* 25. *Ibid.*

the Churches peace and Communion, but even lodging and entertainment: manifestly declaring, that they reckoned them among those whom S. *John* forbids *to receive to house, or to say God speed to them.* All these terrors notwithstanding S. *Cyprian* holds still his former opinion, and though out of respect to the Churches peace [d] *he judged no man, nor cut off any man from the right of Communion, for thinking otherwise than he held,* yet he conceived *Stephen* and his adherents, [e] to hold a pernitious Error. And S. *Austin,* (though disputing with the *Donatists* he useth some Tergiversation in the point,) yet confesseth elsewhere, that *it is not found that* Cyprian *did ever change his opinion.* And so far was he from conceiving any necessity of doing so, in submitting to the judgment of the Bishop and Church of *Rome,* that he plainly professeth that no other Bishop, *but our Lord Jesus only, had power to Judge* (with Authority) *of his Judgment,* and as plainly intimates that *Stephen,* for usurping such a power, and making himself *a Judge over Bishops, was little better than a Tyrant:* and as heavily almost he censures him, and peremptorily opposes him as obstinate in Error, in that very place where he delivers that famous saying, *How can he have God for his Father, who hath not the Church for his Mother?* little doubting it seems but a man might have the Church for his Mother, who stood in opposition to the Church of *Rome,* and far from thinking what you fondly obtrude upon him, that to be United to the *Roman* Church, and to the Church was all one, and that separation from S. *Peters* Chair was a mark, I mean a certain mark, either of Schism or *Heresie.*

[d] *Vide Con. Carth. apud Fur. To.* 1:

[e] *Bell. l.* 2. *de Conc. c.* 5. *Aug. ep.* 48. *& lib.* 1. *de Bapt. c.* 18.

26. But you have given a false or at least a strained Translation of S. *Cyprians* forecited Words; for *Cyprian* saith not *to whom falshood cannot have access,* as if he had exempted the *Roman* Church from a possibility of Error, but to whom *perfidiousness cannot have access,* meaning those perfidious Schismaticks, whom he there complains of; and of these by a Rhetorical insinuation, he says that *with such good Christians as the* Romans *were, it was not possible they should find favourable entertainment.* As for his joyning the *Principal Church* and the *Chair of* Peter, how that will serve

ſerve to prove ſeparation from the *Roman* Church to be a mark of *Hereſie*, it is hard to underſtand. Though we do not altogether deny, but that the Church of *Rome* might be called the *Chair of S.* Peter, in regard he is ſaid to have Preached the Goſpel there; and the *principal Church*, becauſe the City was the principal and imperial City, which prerogative of the City, if we believe the Fathers of the Council of *Chalcedon*, was the ground and occaſion, why the Fathers of former times (I pray obſerve) conferred upon this Church this prerogative above other Churches.

27. Obj. *But in another place* (Epiſt. 52.) *S.* Cyprian *makes Communicating with* Cornelius (the Biſhop of *Rome*) *and with the* Catholick *Church to be the ſame.*

Anſw. This does not prove that to Communicate with the Church and *Pope* of *Rome*, and to Communicate with the *Catholick* Church, is *always* (for that you aſſume) one and the ſame thing. S. *Cyprian* ſpeaks not of the Church of *Rome* at all, but of the Biſhop only, who when he doth Communicate with the *Catholick* Church, as *Cornelius* at that time did, then whoſoever Communicates with him, cannot but Communicate with the *Catholick* Church: and then by accident one may truely ſay, ſuch a one Communicates with you, that is, with the *Catholick* Church, and that to Communicate with him is to Communicate with the *Catholick* Church. As if *Titius* and *Sempronius* be together, he that is in company with *Titius*, cannot but be at that time in company with *Sempronius*. As if a General be marching to ſome place with an Army, he that then is with the General muſt at that time be with the Army: And a man may ſay without abſurdity, ſuch a time I was with the General, that is, with the Army, and that to be with the General is to be with the Army. Or as if a mans hand be joyned to his Body, the finger which is joyned to the hand is joyned to the Body, and a man may ſay truly of it, this finger is joyned to the hand, that is, to the Body, and to be joyned to the hand is to be joyned to the Body; becauſe all theſe things are by accident true. And yet I hope you would not deny,

but

but the finger might possibly be joyned to the hand, and yet not to the Body, the hand being cut off from the Body; and a man might another time, be with his General and not with his Army, he being absent from the Army. And therefore by like Reason your collection is Sophistical, being in effect but this, to communicate with such a Bishop of *Rome*, who did Communicate with the *Catholick* Church, was to Communicate with the *Catholick* Church, therefore absolutely and always it must be true, that to Communicate with him, is by consequent to Communicate with the *Catholick* Church, and to be divided from the Communion, is to be an *Heretick.*

28. Obj. *S.* Irenæus *saith,* (lib. 3. cont. hær: c. 3.) *Because it were long to number the successions of all Churches, we declaring the Tradition of the most great most Ancient and known Church, founded by the two glorious Apostles* Peter *and* Paul, *which Tradition it hath from the Apostles, coming to us by succession of Bishops, we confound all those who any way either by vain Glory, Blindness, or ill Opinion do gather otherwise than they ought. For to this Church for a more powerful Principality, it is necessary that all Churches resort, that is, all faithful People* (undique) *of what place soever: In which* (Roman Church) *the Tradition from the Apostles hath always been conserved from those who are* (undique) *every where.*

Answ. Though at the first, hearing the Glorious Attributes here given (and that justly) to the Church of *Rome, the confounding* Hereticks *with her Tradition, and saying it is necessary for all Churches to resort to her,* may sound like Arguments for you: yet he that is attentive I hope will easily discover, that it might be good and rational in *Irenæus* having to do with Hereticks, who, somewhat like those who would be the only *Catholicks,* declining a tryal by Scripture as not containing the Truth of Christ perfectly, and not fit to decide Controversies without recourse to Tradition: I say he will easily perceive that it might be rational in *Irenæus* to urge them with any Tradition of more credit than their own, especially a Tradition consonant to Scripture, and even contained in it; and yet that

it

it may be irrational in you to urge us, who do not decline Scripture but appeal to it as a perfect rule of Faith, with a Tradition which we pretend is many ways repugnant to Scripture, and repugnant to a Tradition far more general than it self, which gives testimony to Scripture, and lastly repugnant to it self as giving attestation both to Scripture and to Doctrines plainly contrary to Scripture. Secondly, that the Authority of the *Roman* Church was then a far greater Argument of the Truth of her Tradition when it was United with all other Apostolick Churches, than now when it is divided from them, according to that of *Tertullian, Had the Churches Erred they would have varied, but that which is the same in all, cannot be Error but Tradition*; and therefore though *Irenæus* his Argument may be very probable, yet yours may be worth nothing. Thirdly, that fourteen hundred years may have made a great deal of alteration in the *Roman* Church: as Rivers, though near the Fountain they may retain their native and unmixt sincerity, yet in long Progress cannot but take in much mixture that came not from the Fountain. And therefore the *Roman* Tradition though then pure, may now be corrupt and impure: and so this Argument (being one of those things which are the worse for wearing) might in *Irenæus* his time be strong and vigorous, and after declining and decaying may long since have fallen to nothing. Especially considering that *Irenæus* plays the Historian only and not the Prophet, and says only, that the *Apostolick Tradition had been always there as in other Apostolick Churches conserved or observed*, choose you whether, but that *it should be always so* he says not, neither had he any warrant. He knew well enough that there was foretold a *great falling away of* the Churches of Christ to Antichrist: that the *Roman* Church in particular was forewarned that she also, *nay the whole Church of the Gentiles, might fall if they look not to their standing*: and therefore to secure her that she should stand for ever, he had no reason, nor Authority. Fourthly, that it appears manifestly out of this Book of *Irenæus* quoted by you, that the Doctrine of the *Chiliasts* was in his Judgment Apostolick Tradition, as also

it

it was eſteemed (for ought appears to the contrary) by all the Doctors, and Saints, and Martyrs of or about his time, for all that ſpeak of it, or whoſe judgments in the point are any way recorded, are for it: and *Juſtin Martyr* profeſſeth that *all good and Orthodox Chriſtians of his time believed it*, and thoſe that did not, he reckons amongſt Hereticks. Now I demand, was this Tradition one of thoſe that was conſerved, and obſerved in the Church of *Rome*, or was it not? If not, had *Iræneus* known ſo much, he muſt have retracted this commendation of that Church. If it was, then the Tradition of the preſent Church of *Rome* contradicts the Ancient, and accounts it Heretical, and then ſure it can be no certain note of Hereſie to depart from them, who have departed from themſelves, and prove themſelves ſubject unto error by holding contradictions. Fifthly and laſtly, that out of the Story of the Church it is as manifeſt as the light at noon, that though *Iræneus* did eſteem the *Roman* Tradition, a great Argument of the Doctrin which he there delivers and defends againſt the Hereticks of his time, *viz. that there was one God*, yet he was very far from thinking that Church was, and ever ſhould be a ſafe keeper, and an infallible witneſs of Tradition in general: Inaſmuch as in his own life, his action proclaimed the contrary. For when *Victor* Biſhop of *Rome* obtruded the *Roman* Tradition touching the time of *Eaſter* upon the *Aſian* Biſhops under the pain of Excommunication, *and damnation*, *Iræneus*, and all the other Weſtern Biſhops, though agreeing with him in his obſervation yet ſharply reprehended him for Excommunicating the *Aſian* Biſhops for their diſagreeing, plainly ſhewing, that they eſteemed that not a neceſſary doctrin and a ſufficient ground of excommunication, which the Biſhop of *Rome* and his adherents did ſo account of: For otherwiſe how could they have reprehended him for excommunicating them, had they conceived the cauſe of his excommunication juſt and ſufficient? And beſides evidently declaring that they eſteemed not ſeparation from the *Roman* Church a certain mark of Hereſie, ſeeing they eſteemed not them Hereticks though ſeparated and cut off from the *Roman* Church.

31. Obj. S. *Auſtin* ſaith (in Pſalm *cont. partem Donati) It grieves us to ſee you ſo to lie cut off. Number the Prieſts even from the Sea of* Peter; *and conſider in that order of Fathers who ſucceeded; to whom ſhe is the Rock which the proud gates of Hell do not overcome*: Where he ſeems to ſay, that the Succeſſion in the Sea of *Peter*, was the Rock which our Saviour means when he ſaid, *upon this Rock will I build my Church.*

Anſ. I anſwer, Firſt, We have no reaſon to be confident of the truth hereof, becauſe S. *Auſtin* himſelf was not, but retracts it as uncertain, and *leaves to the Reader whether he will think that, or another more probable.* Retr. *l.* 1. *c.* 26. Secondly, what he ſays of the Succeſſion in the *Roman* Church in this place, he ſays it elſewhere, of all the Succeſſions in all other Apoſtolick Churches. Thirdly, that as in this place he urgeth the *Donatiſts* with ſeparation from the *Roman* Church, as an argument of their Error: So elſewhere he preſſeth them with their Separation from other Apoſtolick Churches, nay more from theſe than from that, becauſe in *Rome* the *Donatiſts* had a Biſhop, though not a perpetual Succeſſion of them, but in other Apoſtolick Churches they wanted both. *Theſe ſcattered men* (ſaith he of the *Donatiſts* Epiſt. 165.) *read in the holy Books the Churches to which the Apoſtles wrote, and have no Biſhop in them: But what is more perverſe and mad, than to the Lectors reading theſe Epiſtles to ſay, Peace with you, and to ſeparate from the peace of theſe Churches, to which theſe Epiſtles were written?* So *Optatus* having done you (as it might ſeem) great ſervice, in upbraiding the *Donatiſts* as Schiſmaticks, becauſe they had not Communion with the Church of *Rome*, overthrows and undoes it all again, and as it were with a ſpunge wipes out all that he had ſaid for you, by adding after, that they were Schiſmaticks, becauſe *they had not the fellowſhip of Communion with the ſeven Churches of* Aſia, *to which S.* John *writes:* whereof he pronounces confidently, (though I know not upon what ground) *Extra ſeptem Eccleſias quicquid foris eſt, alienum eſt.* Now I pray tell me, do you eſteem the Authority of theſe Fathers a ſufficient aſſurance, that ſeparation from theſe other

A-

Apoſtolick Churches, was a certain mark of Hereſie, or not? If ſo, then your Church hath been for many Ages heretical. If not, how is their authority, a greater argument for the *Roman*, than for the other Churches? If you ſay, they conceived ſeparation from theſe Churches a note of Schiſm, only when they were united to the *Roman*: ſo alſo they might conceive of the *Roman*, only when it was united to them. If you ſay, they urged this only as a probable, and not as a certain Argument, ſo alſo they might do that. In a word, whatſoever anſwer you can deviſe to ſhew, that theſe Fathers made not ſeparation from theſe other Churches a mark of Hereſie, apply that to your own Argument, and it will be ſatisfied.

33. You ſee S. *Auſtins* words make very little, or indeed nothing for you. But now his Action, (which according to Cardinal *Perrons* rule, is much more to be regarded than his words, as not being ſo obnoxious to miſinterpretation) [a] I mean his famous oppoſition of three Biſhops of *Rome* in Succeſſion, touching the great queſtion of Appeals, wherein he and the reſt of the *African* Biſhops proceeded ſo far in the firſt or ſecond *Milevitan* Council, as to [b] *decree any* African *Excommunicate, that ſhould appeal to any man out of* Africk, and therein continued reſolute unto death: I ſay this famous Action of his, makes clearly and evidently and infinitely againſt you. For had *Boniface*, and the reſt of the *African* Biſhops, a great part whereof were Saints and Martyrs, believed as an Article of Faith, that Union and Conformity with the Doctrin of the *Roman* Church, in all things which ſhe held neceſſary, was a certain note of a good Catholick, and by Gods command neceſſary to Salvation, how was it poſſible they ſhould have oppoſed it in this? Unleſs you will ſay they

[a] You do ill to tranſlate it, *the Principality of the Sea Apoſtolick*, as if there were but one: whereas S. *Auſtin* preſently after ſpeaks of Apoſtolical Churches, in the plural number, and makes the Biſhops of them, joynt Commiſſioners for the judging of Eccleſiaſtical cauſes.

[b] The words of the Decree (which alſo *Bellarmine* l. 1. *de Matrim.* c. 17. aſſures us to have been formed by S. *Auſtin*) are theſe. *Si qui (Africani,) ab Epiſcopis provocandum putaverint, non niſi ad Africana provocent Concilia, vel ad Primates provinciarum ſuarum. Ad tranſmarina autem, qui putaverit appellandum, à nullo intra Africam in Communionem ſuſcipiatur.* This Decree is by *Gratian* moſt impudently corrupted. For whereas the Fathers of that Council intended it particularly againſt the *Church of Rome*, he tells us they forbad Appeals to all, *excepting only the Church of Rome.*

were all so foolish as to believe at once direct contradictions, *viz.* that conformity to the *Roman* Church was necessary in all points, and not necessary in this: or else so horribly impious, as believing this doctrin of the *Roman* Church true, and her power to receive Appeals derived from divine Authority, notwithstanding to oppose and condemn it, and to Anathematize all those *Africans*, of what condition soever, that should appeal unto it. I say *of what condition soever*: For it is evident, that they concluded in their determination, Bishops as well as the inferior Clergy and Laity: And Cardinal *Perrons* pretence of the contrary, is a shameless falshood, repugnant to the plain words of the Remonstrance of the *African* Bishops to *Celestine* Bishop of *Rome*.

[a] The words are these, *Præfato debito salutationis officio, impendio deprecamur; ut deinceps ad aures vestras hinc venientes, non facilius admittatis; nec à nobis excommunicatos ultra in Communionem velitis recipere, quia hoc etiam Niceno Concilio definitum facile advertet venerabilitas tua. Nam si de inferioribus Clericis vel Laicis videtur id præcaveri, quanto magis hoc de Episcopis voluit observari.*

34. Obj. *Tertullian* saith (Præscrip. cap. 36.) *If thou be near* Italy, *thou hast* Rome, *whose Authority is near at hand to us: a happy Church, into which the Apostles have poured all Doctrin, together with their blood.*

Ans. Your allegation of *Tertullian* is a manifest conviction of your want of sincerity: For you produce with great ostentation what he says of the Church of *Rome*, but you and your fellows always conceal and dissemble, that immediately before these words he attributes as much for point of direction to any other Apostolick Church, and that as he sends them to *Rome* who lived near *Italy*, so those near *Achaia* he sends to *Corinth*, those about *Macedonia* to *Philippi*, and *Thessalonica*, those of *Asia* to *Ephesus*. His words are, *Go to now thou that wilt better imploy thy curiosity in the business of thy salvation, run over the Apostolical Churches, wherein the Chairs of the Apostles are yet sate upon in their places, wherein their Authentick Epistles are recited, sounding out the voyce, and representing the face of every one! Is* Achaia *near thee? there thou hast* Corinth: *If thou art not far from* Macedonia, *thou hast* Philippi,

thou

thou hast Thessalonica: *If thou canst go into* Asia, *there thou hast* Ephesus: *If thou be adjacent to* Italy, *thou hast* Rome, *whose Authority is near at hand to us* (in *Africk*;) *A happy Church, into which the Apostles poured forth all their Doctrine together with their Blood,* &c. Now I pray Sirtell me, if you can for blushing, why this place might not have been urged by a *Corinthian,* or *Philippian,* or *Thessalonian,* or an *Ephesian,* to shew that in the Judgment of *Tertullian,* separation from any of their Churches is a certain mark of Heresie, as justly and rationally as you alledge it to vindicate this priviledge to the *Roman* Church only? Certainly if you will stand to *Tertullians* judgment, you must either grant the authority of the *Roman* Church (though at that time a good Topical Argument, and perhaps a better than any the Hereticks had, especially in conjunction with other Apostolick Churches:) yet, I say you must grant it perforce but a Fallible Guide as well as that of *Ephesus*, and *Thessalonica*, and *Philippi*, and *Corinth:* or you must maintain the authority of every one of these infallible, as well as the *Roman.* For though he make a *Panegyrick* of the *Roman* Church in particular, and of the rest only in general, yet as I have said, for point of direction he makes them all equal; and therefore makes them (choose you whether) either all fallible, or all infallible: Now you will and must acknowledge that he never intended to attribute infallibility to the Churches of *Ephesus,* or *Corinth,* or if he did, that (as experience shews) he Erred in doing so; and what can hinder, but then we may say also that he never intended to attribute infallibility to the *Roman* Church, or if he did that he Erred in doing so?

38. Ad §. 20, 21, 22, 23.] The sum of your discourse in these Sections, if it be pertinent to the Question, must be this. *Want of Succession of Bishops and Pastors holding always the same Doctrine, and of the forms of ordaining Bishops and Priests which are in use in the* Roman *Church, is a certain mark of Heresie: But* Protestants *want all these things: Therefore they are Hereticks.* To which I answer, That nothing but want of truth and holding Error, can make or prove any

any man or Church Heretical. For if he be a true *Ariſtotelian*, or *Platoniſt*, or *Pyrrhonian*, or *Epicurean*, who holds the Doctrine of *Ariſtotle*, or *Plato*, or *Pirrho*, or *Epicurus*, although he cannot aſſign any that held it before him for many Ages together, why ſhould I not be made a true and Orthodox Chriſtian, by believing all the Doctrine of Chriſt, though I cannot derive my deſcent from a perpetual Succeſſion that believed it before me? By this reaſon you ſhould ſay as well, that no man can be a good Biſhop or Paſtor, or King or Magiſtrate, or Father that ſucceeds a bad one. For if I may conform my will and actions to the Commandments of God, why may I not embrace his Doctrine with my underſtanding, although my predeceſſor do not ſo? You have above in this Chapter defined *Faith a free Infallible, obſcure, ſupernatural aſſent to Divine Truths, becauſe they are revealed by God and ſufficiently propounded:* This definition is very phantaſtical; but for the preſent I will let it paſs, and deſire you to give me ſome piece of ſhadow or reaſon, why I may not do all this without a perpetual Succeſſion of Biſhops and Paſtors that have done ſo before me? You may judge as uncharitably, and ſpeak as maliciouſly of me, as your blind zeal to your Superſtition ſhall direct you, but certainly I know, (and with all your Sophiſtry you cannot make me doubt of what I know,) that I do believe the Goſpel of Chriſt (as it is delivered in the undoubted Books of Canonical Scripture, as verily as that it is now day, that I ſee the light, that I am now writing: and I believe it upon this Motive, becauſe I conceive it ſufficiently, abundantly, ſuperabundantly proved to be Divine Revelation: And yet in this, I do not depend upon any Succeſſion of men that have always believed it without any mixture of Error; nay I am fully perſuaded, there hath been no ſuch Succeſſion, and yet do not find my ſelf any way weakned in my Faith by the want of it; but ſo fully aſſured of the truth of it, that not only, though your Devils at *Lowden* do tricks againſt it, but though an Angel from Heaven ſhould gainſay it or any part of it, I perſuade my ſelf that I ſhould not be moved. This I ſay, and this I am ſure is true: and if you will be ſo Hyperſceptical

sceptical as to persuade me, that I am not sure that I believe all this, I desire you to tell me, how are you sure that you believe the Church of *Rome*? For if a man may persuade himself he doth believe what he doth not believe, then may you think you believe the Church of *Rome*, and yet not believe it. But if no man can Err concerning what he believes, then you must give me leave to assure my self that I do believe, and consequently that any man may believe the aforesaid truths upon the aforesaid motives, without any dependence upon any Succession that hath believed it always. And as from your definition of Faith, so from your definition of Heresie, this fancy may be refuted. For questionless no man can be an Heretick but he that holds an Heresie, and an Heresie you say *is a Voluntary Error*; therefore no man can be necessitated to be an Heretick whether he will or no, by want of such a thing that is not in his power to have: But that there should have been a perpetual Succession of Believers in all points Orthodox, is not a thing which is in your power, therefore our being or not being Hereticks depends not on it. Besides, what is more certain, than that he may make a streight line, who hath a Rule to make it by, though never man in the World had made any before: and why then may not he that believes the Scripture to be the Word of God, and the Rule of Faith, regulate his Faith by it, and consequently believe aright without much regarding what other men either will do or have done? It is true indeed there is a necessity that if God will have his Words believed, he by his Providence must take order, that either by Succession of men, or by some other means natural or supernatural, it be preserved and delivered, and sufficiently notified to be his Word; but that this should be done by a Succession of men that holds no Error against it, certainly there is no more necessity, than that it should be done by a Succession of men that commit no sin against it. For if men may preserve the Records of a Law, and yet transgress it, certainly they may also preserve directions for their Faith, and yet not follow them. I doubt not but Lawyers at the Barr do find by frequent experience, that

that many men preſerve and produce evidences, which being examined oftimes make againſt themſelves. This they do ignorantly, it being in their power to ſuppreſs, or perhaps to alter them. And why then ſhould any man conceive it ſtrange, that an erroneous and corrupted Church ſhould preſerve and deliver the Scriptures uncorrupted, when indeed for many reaſons which I have formally alleged, it was impoſſible for them to corrupt them? Seeing therefore this is all the neceſſity that is pretended of a perpetual Succeſſion of men Orthodox in all points, certainly there is no neceſſity at all of any ſuch, neither can the want of it prove any man or any Church Heretical.

39. When therefore you have produced ſome proof of this, (which was your Major in your former Syllogiſm,) That want of Succeſſion is a certain mark of Hereſie, you ſhall then receive a full anſwer to your Minor. We ſhall then conſider whether your indelible Character be any reality, or whether it be a Creature of your own making, a fancy of your own imagination? And if it be a thing, and not only a Word, whether our Biſhops and Prieſts have it not as well as yours; and whether ſome mens perſuaſion that there is no ſuch thing, can hinder them from having it, or prove that they have it not if there be any ſuch thing? (Any more than a mans perſuaſion that he has not taken Phyſick or Poyſon, will make him not to have taken it if he has, or hinder the operation of it?) And whether *Tertullian* in the place quoted by you, ſpeak of a Prieſt made a Lay-man, by a juſt depoſition or degradation, and not by a voluntary deſertion of his Order? And whether in the ſame place he ſet not ſome mark upon Hereticks that will agree to your Church? Whether all the Authority of our Biſhops in *England* before the Reformation, was conferred on them by the *Pope*? And if it were, whether it were the *Popes* right, or an Uſurpation? If it were his right, whether by Divine Law or Eccleſiaſtical? And if by Eccleſiaſtical only, whether he might poſſibly ſo abuſe his power, as to deſerve to loſe it? Whether *de facto* he had done ſo? Whether ſuppoſing he had deſerved to loſe it, thoſe that deprived him of it had power to take it from him?

him? Or if not, whether they had power to suspend him from the use of it, until good caution were put in, and good assurance given, that if he had it again, he would not abuse it as he had formerly done? Whether in case they had done unlawfully that took his power from him, it may not (things being now setled, and the present Government established) be as unlawful to go about to restore it? whether it be not a Fallacy to conclude, because we believe the *Pope* hath no power in *England*, now when the King and State and Church hath deprived him upon just grounds of it, therefore we cannot believe that he had any before his deprivation? Whether without Schism, a man may not withdraw obedience from an Usurped Authority commanding unlawful things? Whether the *Roman* Church might not give Authority to Bishops and Priests to oppose her Errors, as well as a King gives Authority to a Judge to judge against him, if his cause be bad; as well as *Trajan* gave his Sword to his Prefect, with this commission, that *if he Governed well, he should use it for him, if ill against.* Whether the *Roman* Church gave not Authority to her Bishops and Priests to Preach against her corruptions in manners? And if so, why not against her Errors in Doctrine, if she had any? Whether she gave them not Authority to Preach the whole Gospel of Christ, and consequently against her Doctrine, if it should contradict any part of the Gospel of Christ? Whether it be not acknowledged lawful in the Church of *Rome*, for any Lay-man or Woman that has ability to persuade others by Word or by Writing from Error, and unto truth? And why this Liberty may not be practised against their Religion, if it be false, as well as for it if it be true? Whether any man need any other Commission or Vocation than that of a Christian, to do a work of Charity? And whether it be not one of the greatest works of Charity (if it be done after a peaceable manner, and without any unnecessary disturbance of order,) to persuade men out of a false, unto a true way of Eternal happiness? Especially the Apostle having assured us, that he, (whosoever he is) *who converteth a sinner from the Error of his way, shall save a Soul from*

Death, and ſhall hide a multitude of Sins? Whether the firſt Reformed Biſhops died all at once, ſo that there were not enough to ordain others in the places that were vacant? Whether the Biſhops of *England* may not Conſecrate a Metropolitan of *England*, as well as the Cardinals do the *Pope?* whether the King or Queen of *England*, or they that have the Government in their Hands, in the minority of the Prince, may not lawfully commend one to them to be conſecrated, againſt whom there is no Canonical exception? Whether the Doctrine, that the King is ſupream head of the Church of *England*, (as the Kings of *Judah*, and the firſt Chriſtian Emperors were of the Jewiſh and Chriſtian Church,) be any new found Doctrine? Whether it be not true, that Biſhops being made Biſhops, have their Authority immediately from Chriſt, though this or that man be not made Biſhop without the Kings Authority; as well as you ſay, the *Pope* being *Pope*, has Authority immediately from Chriſt, and yet this or that man cannot be made *Pope* without the Authority of the Cardinals? Whether you do well to ſuppoſe, that Chriſtian Kings have no more Authority in ordering the affairs of the Church, than the great *Turk*, or the *Pagan* Emperors? Whether the King may not give Authority to a Biſhop to exerciſe his function in ſome part of his Kingdom, and yet not be capable of doing it himſelf: as well as a Biſhop may give Authority to a Phyſician, to practice Phyſick in his Dioceſs, which the Biſhop cannot do himſelf? Whether if *Nero* the Emperor would have commanded S. *Peter* or S. *Paul* to Preach the Goſpel of Chriſt, and to exerciſe the office of a Biſhop of *Rome*, whether they would have queſtioned his Authority to do ſo? Whether there were any Law of God or man, that prohibited K. JAMES to give Commiſſion to Biſhops, nay to lay his injunction upon them, to do any thing that is lawful? Whether a caſual irregularity may not be lawfully diſpenced with? Whether the *Popes* irregularities if he ſhould chance to incur any, be indiſpenſable? And if not, who is he, or who are they, whom the *Pope* is ſo ſubject unto, that they may diſpenſe with him? Whether that

that be certain which you take for granted; *That your Ordination imprints a Character and ours doth not?* Whether the power of Consecrating and Ordaining by imposition of hands, may not reside in the Bishops, and be derived unto them, not from the King but God; and yet the King have Authority to command them to apply this power to such a fit person, whom he shall commend unto them: As well as if some Architects only had the faculty of *Architecture*, and had it immediately by infusion from God himself, yet, if they were the Kings Subjects, he wants not authority to command them to build him a Palace for his use, or a fortress for his service: Or as the King of *France* pretends not to have power to make Priests himself, yet I hope, you will not deny him power to command any of his Subjects that has this power, to ordain any fit person Priest, whom he shall desire to be ordained? Whether it do not follow, that whensoever the King commands an House to be Built, a Message to be delivered, or a Murtherer to be Executed, that all these things are presently done without intervention of the Architect, Messenger, or Executioner: As well as, that they are *ipso facto* Ordained and Consecrated, who by the Kings Authority are commended to the Bishops to be Ordained and Consecrated: Especially seeing the King will not deny, but that these Bishops may refuse to do what he requires to be done, lawfully if the person be unworthy, if worthy, unlawfully indeed, but yet *de facto* they may refuse: and in case they should do so, whether justly or unjustly; neither the King himself, nor any Body else, would esteem the person Bishop upon the Kings designation? Whether many *Popes*, though they were not Consecrated Bishops by any temporal Prince, yet might not, or did not receive authority from the Emperor to exercise their Episcopal function in this or that place? And whether the Emperors had not authority, upon their desert, to deprive them of their jurisdiction, by imprisonment or banishment? Whether Protestants do indeed pretend that their Reformation is Universal? Whether in saying, the *Donatists Sect was confined to* Africa, you do not forget your self, and con-

tradict what you ſaid above, in §. 17. of this Chapter, where you tell us, *they had ſome of their Sect reſiding in* Rome? Whether it be certain, that none can admit of Biſhops willingly, but thoſe that hold them of Divine inſtitution? Whether they may not be willing to have them, conceiving that way of Government the beſt, though not abſolutely neceſſary? Whether all thoſe *Proteſtants* that conceive the diſtinction between Prieſts and Biſhops, not to be of Divine inſtitution, be Schiſmatical and Heretical for thinking ſo? Whether your form of ordaining Biſhops and Prieſts, be eſſential to the conſtitution of a true Church? Whether the forms of the Church of *England* differ eſſentially from your forms? Whether in ſaying, that *the true Church cannot ſubſiſt without undoubted true Biſhops and Prieſts*, you have not overthrown the truth of your own Church: wherein I have proved it plainly impoſſible, that any man ſhould be ſo much as morally certain, either of his own Prieſthood or any other mans? Laſtly, whether any one kind of theſe external Forms and Orders, and Government be ſo neceſſary to the being of a Church, but that they may not be diverſe in diverſe places, and that a good and peaceable Chriſtian may and ought to ſubmit himſelf to the Government of the place where he lives whatſoever it be? All theſe Queſtions will be neceſſary to be diſcuſſed for the clearing of the truth of the *Minor* propoſition of your former Syllogiſm, and your proofs of it: and I will promiſe to debate them fairly with you, if firſt you will bring ſome better proof of the *Major, That want of Succeſſion is a certain note of Hereſie*, which for the preſent remains both unproved and unprobable.

40. *Obj.* You ſay, *The Fathers aſſign Succeſſion as one mark of the true Church.*

Anſw. I confeſs they did urge Tradition as an Argument of the Truth of their Doctrine and of the falſhood of the contrary; and thus far they agree with you. But now ſee the difference: They urged it not againſt all Hereticks that ever ſhould be, but againſt them who rejected a great part of the Scripture, for no other reaſon but *becauſe it was repugnant to their Doctrine, and corrupted other parts with*

with their additions and detractions, and perverted the remainder with divers abſurd interpretations: So *Tertullian* not a leaf before the words by you cited. Nay they urged it againſt them who *when they were confuted out of Scripture, fell to accuſe the Scriptures themſelves as if they were not right, and came not from good authority, as if they were various one from another, and as if truth could not be found out of them, by thoſe who know not Tradition, for that it was not delivered in writing,* (they did mean wholly,) *but by word of mouth: And that thereupon* Paul *alſo ſaid, we ſpeak wiſdom amongſt the perfect.* So *Irenæus* in the very next Chapter before that which you alledge. Againſt theſe men being thus neceſſitated to do ſo, they did urge Tradition, but what or whoſe Tradition was it? Certainly no other but the joynt Tradition of all the Apoſtolick Churches, with one Mouth and one Voice teaching the ſame Doctrine. Or if for brevity ſake they produce the Tradition of any one Church, yet is it apparent, that that one was then in conjunction with all the reſt; *Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen,* teſtifie as much in the words cited, and S. *Auſtin,* in the place before alledged by me. This Tradition they did urge againſt theſe men, and in a time, in compariſon of ours, almoſt contiguous to the Apoſtles: So near, that one them, *Irenæus,* was Scholar to one who was Scholar to S. *John* the Apoſtle. *Tertullian* and *Origen* were not an Age removed from him: and the laſt of them all, little more than an Age from them. Yet after all this they urged it not as a demonſtration, but only as a very probable argument, far greater than any their Adverſaries could oppoſe againſt it. So *Tertullian* in the place above quoted, §. 5. *How is it likely that ſo many and ſo great Churches ſhould Err in one Faith?* (it ſhould be, ſhould have Erred into one Faith.) And this was the condition of this Argument as the Fathers urged it. Now if you having to deal with us, who queſtion no Book of Scripture, which was not Anciently queſtioned by ſome whom you your ſelves eſteem good Catholicks; nay who refuſe not to be tried by your own Canons, your own Tranſlations, who in interpreting Scriptures are content to allow of all thoſe rules which you propoſe, only except

except that we will not allow you to be our Judges; if you will come fifteen hundred years after the Apoſtles, a fair time for the pureſt Church to gather much droſs and corruptions, and for the *myſtery of iniquity* to bring its work to ſome perfection, which *in the Apoſtles time began to work,* If (I ſay) you will come thus long after and urge us with the ſingle Tradition of one of theſe Churches, being now Catholick to it ſelf alone, and Heretical to all the reſt: nay not only with her Ancient Original Traditions, but alſo with her poſt-nate and introduced Definitions, and theſe as we pretend, repugnant to Scripture, and Ancient Tradition, and all this to decline an indifferent Trial by Scripture, under pretence (wherein alſo you agree with the calumny of the Old Hereticks) that *all neceſſary truth cannot be found in them without recourſe to Tradition:* If, I ſay, notwithſtanding all theſe differences, you will ſtill be urging us with this argument, as the very ſame and of the ſame force with that wherewith the fore-mentioned Fathers urged the Old Hereticks, certainly this muſt needs proceed from a confidence you have, not only that we have no School-Divinity, nor Metaphyſicks, but no Logick or common ſenſe, that we are but Pictures of men, and have the definition of rational creatures given us in vain.

41. But now ſuppoſe I ſhould be liberal to you, and grant what you cannot prove, that the Fathers make Succeſſion a certain and perpetual mark of the true Church; I beſeech you what will come of it? What, that want of Succeſſion is a certain ſign of an Heretical company? Truly if you ſay ſo, either you want Logick, which is a certain ſign of an ill diſputer; or are not pleaſed to uſe it, which is a worſe. For ſpeech is a certain ſign of a living man, yet want of ſpeech is no ſure argument that he is dead, for he may be dumb and yet living ſtill, and we may have other evident tokens that he is ſo, as Eating, Drinking, Breathing, Moving: So, though the conſtant and Univerſal delivery of any Doctrine by the Apoſtolick Churches ever ſince the Apoſtles, be a very great argument of the truth of it, yet there is no certainty, but that

that truth, even Divine truth, may through mens wickedness, be contracted from its universality, and interrupted in its perpetuity, and so lose this argument, and yet not want others to justifie and support it self. For it may be one of those principles which God hath written in all mens Hearts, or a conclusion evidently arising from them: It may be either contained in Scripture in expres terms, or deducible from it by apparent consequence. If therefore you intend to prove want of a perpetual Succession of Professors a certain note of Heresie, you must not content your self to shew, that having it is one sign of truth; but you must shew it to be the only sign of it and inseparable from it. But this, if you be well advised, you will never undertake. First because it is an impossible attempt: and then because if you do it you will marr all: for by proving this an inseparable sign of Catholick Doctrine, you will prove your own, which apparently wants it in many points, not to be Catholick. For whereas you say *this Succession requires two things, agreement with the Apostles Doctrine, and an uninterrupted conveyance of it down to them that challenge it:* It will be proved against you that you fail in both points; and that some things wherein you agree with the Apostles have not been held alwaies, as your condemning the Doctrine of the *Chiliasts*, and holding the Eucharist not necessary for Infants; and that in many other things you agree not with them nor with the Church for many Ages after. For example; In mutilation of the Communion, in having your Service in such a Language as the Assistants generally understand not, your offering to Saints, your Picturing of God, your worshiping of Pictures.

42. Ad §. 24.] Obj. *The true Church must have Universality of place which* Protestants *wanting cannot avoid the just note of Heresie.*

Answ. You have not set down clearly and univocally what you mean by it, whether Universality of fact or of right: and if of fact, whether absolute or comparative: and if comparative, whether of the Church in comparison of any other Religion, or only of Heretical Christians: or if in comparison of these, whether in comparison of

of all other Sects conjoyned, or in comparison only of any one of them. Nor have you proved it by any good argument in any sense to be a certain mark of Heresie: For those places of S. *Austin* do not deserve the name. And truly in my judgment you have done advisedly in proving it no better. For as for Universality of right, or a right to Universality, all Religions claim it, but only the true has it, and which has it cannot be determined, unless it first be determined which is the true. An absolute Universality, and diffusion through all the World if you should pretend to, all the World would laugh at you. If you should contend for latitude with any one Religion, *Mahumetism* would carry the Victory from you. If you should oppose your selves against all other Christians besides you, it is certain you would be cast in this suit also. If lastly, being hard driven you should please your selves with being more than any one Sect of Christians, it would presently be replied, that it is uncertain whether now you are so, but most certain that the time has been when you have not been so. Then when the [a] *whole World wondered that it was become Arrian:* then when *Athanasius opposed the World, and the World Athanasius*: then when [b] *your Liberius* having the contemptible paucity of his adherents objected to him as a note of Error, answered for himself, *There was a time when there were but three opposed the decree of the King, and yet those three were in the right, and the rest in the wrong*: then when the *Professors of Error surpassed the number of the Professors of truth in proportion, as the sands of the Sea do the Stars of the Heaven.* (As [c] S. *Austin* acknowledgeth:) then when [d] *Vincentius* confesseth, that *the Poyson of the Arrians had contaminated, not now some certain portion, but almost the whole World:* then when the Author of *Nazianzens* Life testifies, *That* [e] *the Heresie of* Arrius, *had possessed in a manner the whole extent of the World*; and when *Nazianzen* found cause to cry out, [f] *Where are they who reproach us with our poverty, who define the Church by the multitude, and despise the little flock? They have the People, but we the Faith.* And lastly when *Athanasius* was so overborn with Sholes and Floods of *Arrians*,

[a] *Hierom. Cont. Luciferianos.*

[b] *In Theodoret. Hist. 16. c. l. 2.*

[c] *In ep. 48. ad Vincentium.*

[d] *Commenitorii. lib. 1. c. 4.*

[e] *In vita Nazianz.*

[f] *In Orat. Arian. & pro seipso.*

Arrians, that he was enforced to write a Treatise on purpose [g] against those, *who judge of the truth only by plurality of adherents.* So that if you had proved want of Universality even thus restrained, to be an infallible note of Heresie, there would have been no remedy but you must have confessed, that the time was when you were Hereticks. And besides, I see not how you would have avoided this great inconvenience, of laying grounds and storeing up arguments for Antichrist, against he comes, by which he may prove his Company the true Church. For it is evident out of Scripture, and confessed by you, that though his time be not long, his dominion shall be very large; and that the true Church shall be then, the *woman driven into the wilderness.*

[g] *Tom.* 2.

45. *Ad* §. 25. 26] You endeavor to prove that the Faith of Protestants is no Faith, being destitute of its due qualifications.

Obj. *First*, you say, *their belief wanteth certainty, because they denying the Universal Infallibility of the Church, can have no certain ground to know what Objects are revealed or testified by God.*

Ans. But if there be no other ground of certainty but your Churches infallibility, upon what certain ground do you know that your Church is infallible? Upon what certain ground do you know all those things which must be known before you can know that your Church is infallible? As that there is a God: that God hath promised his assistance to your Church in all her Decrees: that the Scripture wherein this promise is extant is the word of God: that those Texts of Scripture which you alledge for your infallibility are incorrupted: that that which you pretend is the true sense of them? When you have produced certain grounds for all these things, I doubt not but it will appear, that we also may have grounds certain enough to believe our whole Religion, which is nothing else but the Bible, without dependence on the Churches infallibility. Suppose you should meet with a man that for the present, believes neither Church, nor Scripture, nor God, but is ready and willing to believe them all, if you can

ſhew ſome ſufficient grounds to build his faith upon; will you tell ſuch a man there are no certain grounds, by which he may be converted; or there are? If you ſay the firſt, you make all Religion an uncertain thing: If the ſecond, then either you muſt ridiculouſly perſwade, that your Church is infallible, becauſe it is infallible, or elſe that there are other certain grounds beſides your Churches infallibility.

46. Obj. *The Holy Scripture is in it ſelf moſt true and infallible, but without the direction and declaration of the Church, we can neither have certain means to know what Scripture is Canonical, nor what Tranſlations be faithful, nor what is the true meaning of Scripture.*

Anſ. But all theſe things muſt be known, before we can know the direction of your Church to be infallible, for no other proof of it can be pretended, but only ſome Texts of Canonical Scripture, truly interpreted: Therefore either you are miſtaken, in thinking there is no other means to know theſe things, but your Churches infallible direction, or we are excluded from all means of knowing her direction to be infallible.

47. Obj. *But Proteſtants, though they are perſwaded their own opinions are true, and that they have uſed ſuch means as are wont to be preſcribed for underſtanding the Scripture, as Prayer, conferring of Texts,* &c. *Yet by their diſagreement ſhew, that ſome of them are deceived. Now they hold all the Articles of their faith, upon this only ground of Scripture, interpreted by theſe rules, and therefore it is clear, that the ground of their faith is infallible in no point at all.*

Anſ. The firſt of theſe ſuppoſitions muſt needs be true, but the ſecond is apparently falſe: I mean, that every Proteſtant is perſwaded that he hath uſed thoſe means which are preſcribed for underſtanding of Scripture. But that which you collect from theſe ſuppoſitions is clearly inconſequent: and by as good Logick you might conclude, that Logick and Geometry ſtand upon no certain grounds, that the rules of the one, and the principles of the other do ſometimes fail, becauſe the diſagreement of Logicians and Geometricians ſhew, that ſome of them are deceived.

ceived. Might not a Jew conclude as well againſt all Chriſtians, that they have no certain ground whereon to relie in their underſtanding of Scripture, becauſe their diſagreements ſhew that ſome are deceived; becauſe ſome deduce from it the infallibility of a Church, and others no ſuch matter? So likewiſe a Turk might uſe the ſame argument againſt both Jews and Chriſtians, and an Atheiſt againſt all Religions, and a Sceptick againſt all reaſon. Might not the one ſay, Mens diſagreement in Religion, ſhews that there is no certainty in any; and the other, that experience of their contradictions teacheth, that the rules of reaſon do ſometimes fail? Do not you ſee and feel how void of reaſon and how full of impiety your ſophiſtry is? And how tranſported with zeal againſt Proteſtants, you urge arguments againſt them, which if they could not be anſwered, would overthrow not only your own, but all Religion? But God be thanked, the anſwer is eaſie and obvious! For let men but remember not to impute the faults of men but only to men, and then it will eaſily appear, that there may be ſufficient certainty in reaſon, in Religion, in the rules of interpreting Scripture, though men through their faults, take not care to make uſe of them, and ſo run into divers errors and diſſentions.

48. Obj. *But Proteſtants cannot determine what points be fundamental, and therefore muſt remain uncertain, whether or no they be not in ſome fundamental error.*

Anſ. By like reaſon ſince you acknowledge, that every error in points defined and declared by your Church deſtroys the ſubſtance of Faith, and yet cannot determine what points be defined, it followeth that you muſt remain uncertain, whether or no you be not in ſome fundamental error, and ſo want the ſubſtance of Faith, without which there can be no hope of Salvation.

But though we cannot perhaps ſay in particular, thus much, and no more is fundamental, yet believing all the Bible, we are certain enough that we believe all that is fundamental. As he that in a receipt, takes twenty ingredients whereof ten only are neceſſary, though he know not which thoſe ten are, yet taking the whole twenty

he is ſure enough that he has taken all that are neceſſary.

49. Ad §. 29. Obj. *It is generally delivered by Catholick Divines that he who erreth againſt any one revealed truth, loſeth all Divine Faith. Now certainly ſome Proteſtants muſt do ſo, becauſe they hold contradictions, which cannot all be true. Therefore ſome of them at leaſt, have no divine faith.*

Anſ. I paſs by your weakneſs in urging Proteſtants with the authority of your Divines. Yet if the Authority of your Divines were even Canonical, certainly nothing could be concluded from it in this matter, there being not one of them, who delivers for true doctrin this poſition of yours, thus nakedly ſet down, *That any error againſt any one revealed truth deſtroys all divine faith.* For they all require (not your ſelf excepted) that this truth muſt not only be revealed, but revealed publickly, and (all things conſidered) ſufficiently propounded to the erring party, to be one of thoſe, which God under pain of damnation commands all men to believe.

But if the Reader will be at the pains he may ſee this vain fancy confuted, out of one of the moſt rational and profound Doctors of your own Church, I mean *Eſtius*, upon the third Book of the Sententes, the 23. Diſtinct. and the 13. Section, beginning thus. *It is diſputed whether in him who believes ſome of the Articles of our Faith, and disbelieves others, or perhaps ſome one, there be faith properly ſo called in reſpect of that which he does believe?*

50. But *if Proteſtants have certainty, they want obſcurity, and ſo have not that faith, which as the Apoſtle ſaith is of things not appearing.* This argument you proſecute in the next Paragraph; but I can find nothing in it, to convince or perſwade me that Proteſtants cannot have as much certainty as is required to faith, of an object not ſo evident as to beget ſcience. If obſcurity will not conſiſt with certainty in the higheſt degree, then you are to blame for requiring to faith contradicting conditions. If certainty and obſcurity will ſtand together, what reaſon can be imagined that a Proteſtant may not entertain them both as well as a Papiſt? Your bodies and ſouls, your underſtandings and wills

wills are, I think, of the same condition with ours: And why then may not we be certain of an obscure thing as well as you?

51. But then besides, I am to tell you, that you are here, every where, extreamly, if not affectedly mistaken in the Doctrin of Protestants; who though they acknowledge, that the things which they believe are in themselves as certain as any demonstrable or sensible verities, yet pretend not that their certainty of adherence is most perfect and absolute, but such as may be perfected and increased as long as they *walk by faith and not by sight.* And consonant hereunto is their doctrin touching the evidence of the objects whereunto they adhere. For you abuse the world and them, if you pretend that they hold the first of your two principles, That these particular Books are the word of God, (for so I think you mean) either to be in it self evidently certain, or of it self and being devested of the motives of credibility, evidently credible: For they are not so fond as to be ignorant, nor so vain as to pretend, that all men do assent to it, which they would if it were evidently certain, nor so ridiculous as to imagine, that if an *Indian* that never heard of Christ or Scripture, should by chance find a Bible in his own Language, and were able to read it, that upon the reading it he would certainly without a miracle believe it to be the word of God: which he could not chuse if it were evidently credible. What then do they affirm of it? Certainly no more than this, that whatsoever man that is not of a perverse mind, shall weigh with serious and mature deliberation, those great moments of reason which may incline him to believe the Divine authority of Scripture, and compare them with the light objections that in prudence can be made against it, he shall not chuse but find sufficient nay abundant inducements to yield unto it firm faith and sincere obedience. Let that learned man *Hugo Grotius* speak for all the rest, in his Book *of the Truth of Christian Religion*; which Book whosoever attentively perusses shall find that a man may have great reason to be a Christian without dependence upon your Church for any part of it: and that your Religion

ligion is no foundation of, but rather a ſcandal and an objection againſt Chriſtianity. He then in the laſt Chapter of his ſecond Book hath theſe excellent words, 'If 'any be not ſatisfied with theſe arguments aboveſaid, but 'deſires more forcible reaſons for confirmation of the ex-'cellency of Chriſtian Religion, let ſuch know that as 'there are variety of things which be true, ſo are there di-'vers ways of proving or manifeſting the truth. Thus is 'there one way in Mathematicks, another in Phyſicks, a 'third in Ethicks, and laſtly another kind when a matter 'of fact is in queſtion: wherein verily we muſt reſt con-'tent with ſuch Teſtimonies as are free from all ſuſpicion 'of untruth; otherwiſe down goes all the frame and uſe 'of Hiſtory, and a great part of the art of Phyſick, toge-'ther with all dutifulneſs that ought to be between parents 'and children: for matters of practice can no way elſe be 'known but by ſuch Teſtimonies. Now it is the pleaſure 'of Almighty God that thoſe things which he would have 'us to believe (ſo that the very belief thereof may be im-'puted to us for obedience) ſhould not ſo evidently ap-'pear, as thoſe things which are apprehended by ſenſe 'and plain demonſtration, but only be ſo far forth reveal-'ed as may beget faith, and a perſwaſion thereof, in the 'hearts and minds of ſuch as are not obſtinate: That ſo 'the Goſpel may be as a touchſtone for tryal of mens 'judgments, whether they be ſound or unſound. For ſee-'ing theſe arguments, whereof we have ſpoken, have in-'duced ſo many honeſt, godly, and wiſe men to approve 'of this Religion, it is thereby plain enough that the fault 'of other mens infidelity is not for want of ſufficient teſti-'mony, but becauſe they would not have that to be had 'and embraced for truth which is contrary to their wilful 'deſires; it being a hard matter for them to relinquiſh 'their honours, and ſet at naught other commodities; 'which thing they know they ought to do, if they admit of 'Chriſts Doctrin and obey what he hath commanded. 'And this is the rather to be noted of them, for that ma-'ny other hiſtorical narrations are approved by them to be 'true, which notwithſtanding are only manifeſt by autho-'rity,

'rity, and not by any such strong proofs, and persuasi-
'ons, or tokens, as do declare the history of Christ to be
'true; which are evident, partly by the confession of
'those Jews that are yet alive; and partly in those compa-
'nies and congregations of Christians which are any where
'to be found; whereof doubtless there was some cause.
'Lastly, seeing the long duration or continuance of Chri-
'stian Religion, and the large extent thereof can be ascri-
'bed to no human power, therefore the same must be at-
'tributed to miracles: or if any deny that it came to pass
'through a miraculous manner; this very getting so great
'strength and power without a miracle, may be thought to
'surpass any miracle.

52. And now you see I hope that Protestants neither do nor need to pretend to any such evidence in the doctrin they believe, as cannot well consist both with the essence and the obedience of faith. Let us come now to the last nullity which you impute to the faith of Protestants, and that it is *want of prudence*. Touching which point, as I have already demonstrated, that wisdom is not essential to faith, but that a man may truly believe truth, though upon insufficient motives; So I doubt not but I shall make good, that if prudence were necessary to faith, we have better title to it than you; and that if a wiser than *Solomon* were here, he should have better reason to believe the Religion of Protestants than Papists, the Bible rather than the Council of *Trent*. But let us hear what you can say!

53. Ad §. 31. You demand then first of all, *What wisdom was it to forsake a Church confessedly very ancient, and besides which there could be demonstrated no other Visible Church of Christ upon earth?* I answer: Against God and truth there lies no prescription, and therefore certainly it might be great wisdom to forsake ancient Errors for more ancient Truths. One God is rather to be followed than innumerable worlds of men: And therefore it might be great wisdom either for the whole Visible Church, nay for all the men in the world, having wandred from the way of Truth, to return unto it; or for a part of it, nay for one man to do so, although all the world besides were madly resolute

reſolute to do the contrary. It might be great wiſdom to forſake the Errors though of the only Viſible Church, much more the *Roman*, which in conceiving her ſelf the whole Viſible Church, does ſomewhat like the Frog in the Fable, which thought the Ditch he lived in to be all the World.

54. You demand again, *What wiſdom was it to forſake a Church acknowledged to want nothing neceſſary to Salvation, indued with Succeſſion of Biſhops,* &c. uſq; ad *Election or Choice?* I anſwer: Yet might it be great wiſdom to forſake a Church not acknowledged to want nothing neceſſary to Salvation, but accuſed and convicted of many damnable errors: certainly damnable to them who were convicted of them, had they ſtill perſiſted in them after their conviction; though perhaps pardonable (which is all that is acknowledged) to ſuch as ignorantly continued in them. A Church vainly arrogating without poſſibility of proof a perpetual Succeſſion of Biſhops, holding always the ſame doctrine; and with a ridiculous impudence pretending perpetual poſſeſſion of all the world: whereas the world knows, that a little before *Luthers* ariſing, your Church was confined to a part of a part of it. Laſtly a Church vainly glorying in the dependence of other Churches upon her, which yet ſhe ſupports no more than thoſe crouching Anticks which ſeem in great buildings to labour under the weight they bear, do indeed ſupport the Fabrick. For a corrupted and falſe Church may give authority to preach the Truth, and conſequently againſt her own falſhoods and corruptions. Beſides, a falſe Church may preſerve the Scripture true, (as now the Old Teſtament is preſerved by the Jews,) either not being arrived to that height of impiety as to attempt the corruption of it, or not able to effect it, or not perceiving, or not regarding the oppoſition of it to her corruptions. And ſo we might receive from you lawful Ordination and true Scriptures, though you were a falſe Church; and receiving the Scriptures from you (though not from you alone, I hope you cannot hinder us, neither need we ask your leave to believe and obey them. And this, though you be a falſe Church,

Church; and receiving the Scriptures from you (though not from you alone,) I hope you cannot hinder us, neither need we ask your leave, to believe and obey them. And this, though you be a false Church, is enough to make us a true one. As for a *Succession of men that held with us in all points of Doctrine,* it is a thing we need not, and you have as little as we. So that if we acknowledge that your Church before *Luther* was a true Church, it is not for any ends, for any dependence that we have upon you; but because we conceive that in a charitable construction, you may pass for a true Church. Such a Church (and no better) as you do sometimes acknowledge *Protestants* to be, that is, a Company of men, wherein some ignorant Souls may be saved. So that in this ballancing of Religion against Religion, and Church against Church, it seems you have nothing of weight and moment to put into your Scale; nothing but Smoak and Wind, vain shadows and phantastical pretences. Yet if *Protestants* on the other side, had nothing to put in their Seal but those negative commendations which you are pleased to afford them; nothing but, no Unity, nor means to procure it; no farther extent when *Luther* arose than *Luthers* Body; no Universality of time or place; no visibility or being, except only in your Church; no Succession of Persons or Doctrine; no leader but *Luther,* in a quarrel begun upon no ground but passion; no Church, no Ordination, no Scriptures but such as they received from you; if all this were true, and this were all that could be pleaded for Protestants, possibly with an allowance of three grains of partiality your Scale might seem to turn. But then if it may appear that part of these objections are falsly made against them, the rest vainly; that whatsoever of truth is in these imputations, is impertinent to this Tryal, and whatsoever is pertinent is untrue; and besides, that plenty of good matter may be alledged for Protestants which is here dissembled: then I hope, our Cause may be good notwithstanding these pretences.

55. I say then, that want of Universality of time and place, The invisibility or not existence of the professors of

Protestant Doctrine before *Luther*, *Luthers* being alone when he first opposed your Church, Our having our Church, Ordinations, Scriptures, personal and yet not Doctrinal Succession from you, are vain and impertinent allegations, against the truth of our Doctrine and Church. That the entire truth of Christ without any mixture of Error should be professed or believed in all places at any time, or in any place at all times, is not a thing evident in reason, neither have we any Revelation for it. And therefore in relying so confidently on it, you build your House upon the Sand. And what obligation we had either to be so peevish, as to take nothing of yours, or so foolish as to take all, I do not understand. For whereas you say that *this is to be choosers and therefore Hereticks*, I tell you that though all Hereticks are choosers, yet all choosers are not Hereticks, otherwise they also, which choose your Religion must be Hereticks. As for *our wanting Unity and Means of proving it*, Luthers *opposing your Church upon meer passion, our following private men rather than the Catholick Church*; the first and last are meer untruths, for we want not Unity, nor means to procure it in things necessary. Plain places of Scripture, and such as need no interpreter are our means to obtain it. Neither do we follow any private men, but only the Scripture, the Word of God as our rule, and reason, which is also the gift of God given to direct us in all our actions, in the use of this rule. And then for *Luthers opposing your Church upon meer passion*, it is a thing I will not deny because I know not his Heart, and for the same reason you should not have affirmed it. Sure I am, whether he opposed your Church upon reason or no, he had reason enough to oppose it. And therefore if he did it upon passion, we will follow him only in his action and not in his passion, in his opposition, not in the manner of it; and then I presume you will have no reason to condemn us, unless you will say that a good action cannot be done with reason, because some Body before us hath done it upon passion. You see then how imprudent you have been in the choice of your arguments,

to

to prove *Proteſtants* unwiſe in the choice of their Religion.

56. It remains now, that I ſhould ſhew that many reaſons of moment may be alledged for the juſtification of *Proteſtants*, which are diſſembled by you, and not put into the Balance. Know then, Sir, that when I ſay, the Religion of *Proteſtants*, is in prudence to be preferred before yours: as on the one ſide I do not underſtand by your Religion, the Doctrine of *Bellarmine* or *Baronius*, or any other private man amongſt you, nor the Doctrine of the *Sorbon*, or of the *Jeſuits*, or of the *Dominicans*, or of any other particular Company among you, but that wherein you all agree, or profeſs to agree, *the Doctrine of the Council of Trent*: ſo accordingly on the other ſide, by the *Religion of Proteſtants*, I do not underſtand the Doctrine of *Luther* or *Calvin*, or *Melanchthon*; nor the Confeſſion of *Auguſta*, or *Geneva*, nor the Catechiſm of *Heidelburg*, nor the Articles of the Church of *England*, no nor the *Harmony* of *Proteſtant* Confeſſions; but that wherein they all agree, and which they all ſubſcribe with a greater *Harmony*, as a perfect rule of their Faith and Actions, that is, The *Bible*. The *Bible*, I ſay, The *Bible* only is the Religion of *Proteſtants*! Whatſoever elſe they believe beſides it, and the plain, irrefragable, indubitable conſequences of it, well may they hold it as a matter of Opinion; but as matter of Faith and Religion, neither can they with coherence to their own grounds believe it themſelves, nor require the belief of it of others, without moſt high and moſt Schiſmatical preſumption. I for my part after a long (and as I verily believe and hope,) impartial ſearch of *the true way to Eternal Happineſs*, do profeſs plainly that I cannot find any reſt for the ſole of my Foot, but upon this Rock only. I ſee plainly and with mine own eyes, that there are *Popes* againſt *Popes*, Councils againſt Councils, ſome Fathers againſt others, the ſame Fathers againſt themſelves, a Conſent of Fathers of one Age againſt a Conſent of Fathers of another Age, the Church of one Age againſt the Church of another Age. Traditive interpretations of Scripture are pretended, but there are few or none to be found: No Tradition but only of

Scripture, can derive it ſelf from the Fountain, but may be plainly proved, either to have been brought in, in ſuch an Age after Chriſt; or that in ſuch an Age it was not in. In a word, there is no ſufficient certainty but of Scripture only, for any conſidering man to build upon. This therefore, and this only I have reaſon to believe: This I will profeſs, according to this I will live, and for this, if there be occaſion, I will not only willingly, but even gladly loſe my life, though I ſhould be ſorry that Chriſtians ſhould take it from me. Propoſe me any thing out of this Book, and require whether I believe it or no, and ſeem it never ſo incomprehenſible to humane reaſon, I will ſubſcribe it with Hand and Heart, as knowing no demonſtration can be ſtronger than this, God hath ſaid ſo therefore it is true. In other things I will take no mans liberty of judgment from him; neither ſhall any man take mine from me. I will think no man the worſe man, nor the worſe Chriſtian: I will love no man the leſs, for differing in opinion from me. And what meaſure I mete to others I expect from them again. I am fully aſſured that God does not, and therefore that men ought not to require any more of any man than this, To believe the Scripture to be Gods word, to endeavour to find the true ſenſe of it, and to live according to it.

57. This is the Religion which I have choſen after a long deliberation, and I am verily perſuaded that I have choſen wiſely, much more wiſely than if I had guided my ſelf according to your Churches authority. For the Scripture being all true, I am ſecured by believing nothing elſe, that I ſhall believe no falſhood as matter of Faith. And if I miſtake the ſenſe of Scripture, and ſo fall into Error, yet am I ſecure from any danger thereby, if but your grounds be true: becauſe endeavouring to find the true ſenſe of Scripture, I cannot but hold my Error without pertinacy, and be ready to forſake it when a more true and a more probable ſenſe ſhall appear unto me. And then all neceſſary truth being as I have proved, plainly ſet down in Scripture, I am certain by believing Scripture, to believe all

all neceſſary Truth: And he that does ſo, if his life be anſwerable to his Faith, how is it poſſible he ſhould fail of Salvation?

58. Beſides, whatſoever may be pretended to gain to your Church the credit of a Guide, all that and much more may be ſaid for the Scripture. Hath your Church been Ancient? The Scripture is more Ancient. Is your Church a means to keep men at Unity? So is the Scripture to keep thoſe that believe it and will obey it, in Unity of belief, in matters neceſſary or very profitable, and in Unity of Charity in points unneceſſary. Is your Church Univerſal for time or place? Certainly the Scripture is more Univerſal. For all the Chriſtians in the World (thoſe I mean that in truth deſerve this name,) do now, and always have believed the Scripture to be the Word of God: whereas only you ſay that you only are the Church of God, and all Chriſtians beſides you deny it.

59. Thirdly, following the Scripture, I follow that whereby you prove your Churches infallibility, (whereof were it not for Scripture what pretence could you have, or what notion could we have?) and by ſo doing tacitely confeſs, that your ſelves are ſurer of the Truth of the Scripture than of your Churches authority. For we muſt be ſurer of the proof than of the thing proved, otherwiſe it is no proof.

60. Fourthly, following the Scripture, I follow that which muſt be true if your Church be true: for your Church gives atteſtation to it. Whereas if I follow your Church, I muſt follow that which, though Scripture be true, may be falſe; nay which if Scripture be true muſt be falſe, becauſe the Scripture teſtifies againſt it.

61. Fifthly, to follow the Scripture I have Gods expreſs warrant and command, and no colour of any prohibition: But to believe your Church infallible, I have no command at all, much leſs an expreſs command. Nay I have reaſon to fear that I am prohibited to do ſo in theſe Words: *call no man Maſter on Earth: They fell by infidelity, Thou ſtandeſt by Faith, Be not high minded but fear: The Spirit of truth The World cannot receive.*

62. Following

62. Following your Church I muſt hold many things not only above reaſon but againſt it, if any thing be againſt it: whereas following the Scripture I ſhall believe many myſteries but no impoſſibilities; many things above reaſon, but nothing againſt it; many things which had they not been revealed, reaſon could never have diſcovered, but nothing which by true reaſon may be confuted: many things which reaſon cannot comprehend how they can be, but nothing which reaſon can comprehend that it cannot be. Nay I ſhall believe nothing which reaſon will not convince that I ought to believe it: For reaſon will convince any man, unleſs he be of a perverſe mind, that the Scripture is the Word of God: And then no reaſon can be greater than this, God ſays ſo, therefore it is true.

63. Following your Church I muſt hold many things which to any mans judgment that will give himſelf the liberty of judgment, will ſeem much more plainly contradicted by Scripture, than the infallibility of your Church appears to be confirmed by it; and conſequently muſt be ſo fooliſh as to believe your Church exempted from Error upon leſs evidence, rather than ſubject to the common condition of mankind upon greater evidence. Now if I take the Scripture only for my Guide, I ſhall not need to do any thing ſo unreaſonable.

64. If I will follow your Church I muſt believe impoſſibilities, and that with an abſolute certainty, upon motives which are confeſſed to be but only *Prudential* and probable: That is, with a weak Foundation I muſt firmly ſupport a heavy, a monſtrous heavy building: Now following the Scripture I ſhall have no neceſſity to undergo any ſuch difficulties.

65. Following your Church I muſt be ſervant of Chriſt and a Subject of the King, but only *Ad placitum Papæ.* I muſt be prepared in mind to renounce my allegiance to the King, when the *Pope* ſhall declare him an Heretick and command me not to obey him: And I muſt be prepared in mind *to eſteem Vertue Vice, and Vice Vertue, if the* Pope *ſhall ſo determine.* Indeed you ſay it is impoſſible he ſhould do the latter; but that you know is a great queſtion, neither is it fit my obedience to God and the King ſhould depend upon

upon a questionable Foundation. And howsoever, you must grant that if by an impossible supposition the *Popes* commands should be contrary to the law of Christ, that they of your Religion must resolve to obey rather the commands of the *Pope* than the law of Christ. Whereas if I follow the Scripture, I may, nay I must obey my Sovereign in lawful things, though an Heretick, though a Tyrant, and though, I do not say the *Pope*, but the Apostles themselves, nay *an Angel from Heaven should teach any thing against the Gospel of Christ, I may, nay I must denounce Anathema to him.*

66. Following the Scripture I shall believe a Religion, which being contrary to Flesh and Blood, without any assistance from worldly power, wit or policy; nay against all the power and policy of the World prevailed and enlarged it self in a very short time all the World over. Whereas it is too too apparent, that your Church hath got and still maintains her authority over mens Consciences, by counterfeiting false miracles, forging false stories, by obtruding on the World suppositious writings, by corrupting the monuments of former times, and defacing out of them all which any way makes against you, by Wars, by persecutions, by Massacres, by Treasons, by Rebellions; in short, by all manner of Carnal means whether violent or fraudulent.

67. Following the Scripture I shall believe a Religion, the first Preachers of Professors whereof, it is most certain they could have no worldly ends upon the World, that they could not project to themselves by it any of the profits or honours or pleasures of this World, but rather were to expect the contrary, even all the miseries which the World could lay upon them. On the other side, the Head of your Church, the pretended Successor of the Apostles, and Guide of Faith, it is even palpable, that he makes your Religion the instrument of his ambition, and by it seeks to entitle himself *directly or indirectly to the Monarchy of the World.* And besides, it is evident to any man that has but half an eye, that most of those Doctrines which you add to the Scripture do make one way or other, for the honour or temporal profit of the Teachers of them.

68. Fol-

68. Following the Scripture only, I ſhall embrace a Religion of admirable ſimplicity, conſiſting in a manner wholly in the worſhip of God in Spirit and Truth. Whereas your Church and Doctrine is even loaded with an infinity of weak, childiſh, ridiculous, unſavoury ſuperſtitions and ceremonies, and full of that *righteouſneſs* for which *Chriſt ſhall Judge the World.*

69. Following the Scripture, I ſhall believe that which Univerſal, never-failing Tradition aſſures me, that it was by the admirable ſupernatural Work of God confirmed to be the Word of God: whereas never any miracle was wrought, never ſo much as a lame Horſe cured in confirmation of your Churches authority and infallibility. And if any ſtrange things have been done, which may ſeem to give atteſtation to ſome parts of your Doctrine, yet this proves nothing but the truth of the Scripture, which foretold that (Gods providence permitting it, and the wickedneſs of the World deſerving it) *ſtrange ſigns and wonders ſhould be wrought to confirm falſe Doctrine, that they which love not the Truth, may be given over to ſtrange deluſions.* Neither does it ſeem to me any ſtrange thing, that God ſhould permit ſome true wonders to be done to delude them who have forged ſo many to deceive the World.

70. If I follow the Scripture, I muſt not promiſe my ſelf Salvation without effectual dereliction and mortification of all Vices, and the effectual Practice of all Chriſtian Vertues: But your Church opens an eaſier and a broader way to Heaven, and though I continue all my life long in a courſe of ſin, and without the Practice of any Vertue, yet gives me aſſurance that I may be let into Heaven, at a Poſtern-gate, even by any Act of Attrition at the hour of Death, if it be joyned with confeſſion, or by an Act of Contrition without confeſſion.

71. Admirable are the Precepts of piety and humility, of innocence and patience, of liberality, frugality, temperance, ſobriety, juſtice, meekneſs, fortitude, conſtancy and gravity, contempt of the World, love of God and the love of mankind; In a Word, of all Vertues, and againſt

againſt all vice, which the Scriptures impoſe upon us, to be obeyed under pain of damnation: The ſum whereof is in manner compriſed in our *Saviours Sermon upon the Mount*, recorded in the 5, 6, and 7. of S. *Matthew*, which if they were generally obeyed, could not but make the world generally happy, and the goodneſs of them alone were ſufficient to make any wiſe and good man believe that this Religion rather than any other, came from God the fountain of all goodneſs. And that they may be generally obeyed, our Saviour hath ratified them all in the cloſe of his Sermon, with theſe univerſal Sanctions, *Not every one that ſaith Lord Lord, ſhall enter into the Kingdom, but he that doth the will of my Father which is in Heaven:* and again, *whoſoever heareth theſe ſayings of mine and doth them not, ſhall be likned unto a fooliſh man which built his houſe upon the ſand, and the rain deſcended, and the flood came, and the winds blew, and it fell, and great was the fall thereof.* Now your Church, notwithſtanding all this, enervates and in a manner diſſolves and abrogates many of theſe precepts, teaching men that they are not Laws for all Chriſtians, but Counſels of perfection and matters of Supererrogation: that a man ſhall do well if he do obſerve them, but he ſhall not ſin if he obſerve them not; that they are for them who aim at high places in heaven, who aſpire with the two ſons of *Zebede*, to the right hand or to the left hand of Chriſt: But if a man will be content barely to go to heaven, and to be a door-keeper in the houſe of God, eſpecially if he will be content to taſt of Purgatory in the way, he may obtain it at any eaſier purchaſe. Therefore the Religion of your Church is not ſo holy nor ſo good as the doctrin of Chriſt delivered in Scripture, and therefore not ſo likely to come from the Fountain of holineſs and goodneſs.

72. Laſtly, if I follow your Church for my Guide, I ſhall do all one, as if I ſhould follow a Company of blind men in a judgment of colours, or in the choice of a way. For every unconſidering man is blind in that which he does not conſider. Now what is your Church but a Company of unconſidering men, who comfort themſelves be-

cauſe they are a great company together, but all of them, either out of idleneſs refuſe the trouble of a ſevere tryal of their Religion, (as if heaven were not worth it,) or out of ſuperſtition fear the event of ſuch a tryal, that they may be ſcrupled and ſtaggered and diſquieted by it; and therefore, for the moſt part do it not all. Or if they do it, they do it negligently and hypocritically, and perfunctorily, rather for the ſatisfaction of others than themſelves: but certainly without indifference, without liberty of judgment, without a reſolution to doubt of it, if upon examination the grounds of it prove uncertain, or to leave it, if they prove apparently falſe. My own experience aſſures me, that in this imputation I do you no injury: but it is very apparent to all men from your ranking, *doubting of any part of your Doctrin,* among mortal ſins. For from hence it follows, that ſeeing every man muſt reſolve that he will never commit mortal ſin, that he muſt never examine the grounds of it at all, for fear he ſhould be moved to doubt: or if he do, he muſt reſolve that no motives, be they never ſo ſtrong ſhall move him to doubt, but that with his will and reſolution he will uphold himſelf in a firm belief of your Religion, though his reaſon and his underſtanding fail him. And ſeeing this is the condition of all thoſe whom you eſteem good Catholicks, who can deny, but you are a Company of men unwilling and afraid to underſtand, leſt you ſhould do good! That have eyes to ſee and will not ſee, that have *not the love of truth* (which is only to be known by an indifferent tryal,) and therefore deſerve *to be given over to ſtrong deluſions*; men that love darkneſs more than light: in a word, that you are *the blind leading the blind,* and what prudence there can be, in following ſuch Guides, our Saviour hath taught us in ſaying, *If the blind lead the blind, both ſhall fall into the ditch.*

74. Ad §. 32. Your next and laſt argument againſt the faith of Proteſtants is, becauſe *wanting certainty and prudence, it muſt alſo want the fourth condition, Supernaturality. For that being a humane perſwaſion, it is not in the eſſence of it Supernatural; and being imprudent and raſh, it cannot proceed from*

from Divine motion, and so is not supernatural in respect of the cause from which it proceedeth.

Ans. This little discourse stands wholly upon what went before, and therefore must fall together with it. I have proved the Faith of Protestants as certain, and as prudent as the faith of Papists; and therefore if these be certain grounds of supernaturality, our faith may have it as well as yours. I would here furthermore be informed how you can assure us that your faith is not your perswasion or opinion (for you make them all one,) that your Churches doctrine is true? Or if you grant it your perswasion, why is it not the perswasion of men, and in respect of the subject of it, an humane perswasion? I desire also to know, what sense there is in pretending that your perswasion is, not in regard of the object only and cause of it, but in nature or essence of it supernatural? Lastly, whereas you say, that *being imprudent it cannot come from divine motion:* certainly by this reason all they that believe your own Religion, and cannot give a wise and sufficient reason for it, (as millions amongst you cannot) must be condemned to have no supernatural faith: or if not, then without question nothing can hinder, but that the imprudent faith of Protestants may proceed from divine motion, as well as the imprudent faith of Papists.

75. And thus having weighed your whole discourse, and found it altogether lighter than vanity, why should I not invert your conclusion, and say, Seeing you have not proved that whosoever errs against any one point of Faith loseth all divine Faith: nor that any error whatsoever concerning that which by the Parties litigant may be esteemed a matter of faith is a grievous sin, it follows not at all, that when two men hold different doctrines concerning Religion, that but one can be saved? Not that I deny, but that the sentence of S. *Chrysost.* with which you conclude this Chapter may in a good sense be true: for oftimes by *the faith* is meant only that Doctrin which is *necessary to salvation,* and to say that salvation may be had without any the least thing which is necessary to salvation, implies a repugnance and destroys it self. Besides, not to

believe all neceſſary points, and to believe none at all, is for the purpoſe of ſalvation all one; and therefore he that does ſo, may juſtly be ſaid to deſtroy the Goſpel of Chriſt, ſeeing he makes it uneffectual to the end for which it was intended, the Salvation of mens ſouls. But why you ſhould conceive that all differences about Religion are concerning matters of faith, in this high notion of the word, for that I conceive no reaſon.

CHAP. VII.

The ANSWER to the Seventh CHAPTER.

Shewing that Proteſtants are not bound by the Charity which they owe to themſelves, to reunite themſelves to the Roman *Church.*

6. Ad §. 2.] WHereas you ſay, *it is directly againſt Charity to our ſelves, to adventure the omitting of any means neceſſary to ſalvation,* this is true: But ſo is this alſo, that it is directly againſt the ſame Charity, to adventure the omitting any thing, that may any way help or conduce to my ſalvation, that may make the way to it more ſecure or leſs dangerous. And therefore if the errors of the *Roman* Church do but hinder me in this way, or any way endanger it, I am in Charity to my ſelf bound to forſake them, though they be not deſtructive of it. Again, whereas you conclude, *That if by living out of the* Roman *Church we put our ſelves in hazard to want ſomething neceſſary to Salvation, we commit a grievous ſin againſt the vertue of Charity as it reſpects our ſelves:* This conſequence may be good in thoſe which are thus perſwaded of the *Roman* Church, and yet live out of it. But the ſuppoſition is certainly falſe. We may live and die out of the *Roman* Church, without putting our ſelves in any ſuch hazard: Nay to live and die in it is as dangerous as to ſhoot a gulf, which though ſome good ignorant ſouls may do

and

and escape, yet it may well be feared that not one in a hundred but miscarries.

7. *Ad* §. 5.] In this Section I observe, first, this acknowledgment of yours, *That in things necessary only because commanded, a probable ignorance of the commandment excuses the party from all fault, and doth not exclude Salvation.* From which Doctrin it seems to me to follow, that seeing obedience to the *Roman* Church cannot be pretended to be necessary, but only because it is commanded, therefore not only an invincible, but even a probable ignorance of this pretended command, must excuse us from all faulty breach of it, and cannot exclude Salvation. Now seeing this command is not pretended to be expressly delivered, but only to be deduced from the word of God, and that not by the most clear and evident consequences that may be; and seeing an infinity of great objections lies against it, which seem strongly to prove that there is no such command; with what Charity can you suppose that our ignorance of this comand, is not at the least probable, if not all things consider'd, plainly invincible? Sure I am, for my part, that I have done my true endeavour to find it true, and am still willing to do so; but the more I seek, the farther I am from finding, and therefore if it be true, certainly my not finding it is very excusable, and you have reason to be very charitable in your censures of me. 2. Whereas you say, That *besides these things necessary because commanded, there are other things, which are commanded because necessary: of which number you make Divine infallible faith, Baptism in Act for Children, and in desire for those who are come to the use of Reason, and the Sacrament of Confession, for those who have committed mortal sin:* In these words you seem to me to deliver a strange Paradox, *viz.* That Faith, and Baptism, and Confession are not therefore necessary for us, because God appointed them, but are therefore appointed by God because they were necessary for us, antecedently to his appointment; which if it were true, I wonder what it was beside God that made them necessary, and made it necessary for God to command them! Besides, in making faith one of these necessary means, you seem to exclude Infants from

from Salvation: For *Faith comes by hearing*, and they have not heard. In requiring that this Faith ſhould be *divine and infallible*, you caſt your *Credentes* into infinite perplexity, who cannot poſſibly by any ſure mark diſcern whether their Faith be Divine or human, or if you have any certain ſign, whereby they may diſcern, whether they believe your Churches infallibility with Divine or only with humane faith, I pray produce it, for perhaps it may ſerve us to ſhew, that our Faith is Divine as well as yours. Moreover in affirming that *Baptiſm in act is neceſſary for Infants, and for men only in deſire*, You ſeem to me in the latter to deſtroy the foundation of the former. For if a deſire of Baptiſm will ſerve men in ſtead of Baptiſm, then thoſe words of our Saviour, *Unleſs a man be born again of water*, &c. are not to be underſtood literally and rigidly of external Baptiſm; for a deſire of Baptiſm is not Baptiſm, and ſo your foundation of the abſolute neceſſity of Baptiſm is deſtroyed. And if you may gloſs the Text ſo far, as that men may be ſaved by the deſire, without Baptiſm it ſelf, becauſe they cannot have it, why ſhould you not gloſs it a little farther, that there may be ſome hope of the ſalvation of unbaptized infants: to whom it was more impoſſible to have a deſire of Baptiſm, than for the former to have the thing it ſelf? Laſtly, for your *Sacrament of Confeſſion*, we know none ſuch, nor any ſuch abſolute neceſſity of it. They that confeſs their ſins and forſake them ſhall find mercy, though they confeſs them to God only and not to men. They that confeſs them both to God and men, if they do not effectually and in time forſake them, ſhall not find mercy. 3. Whereas you ſay, that *ſuppoſing theſe means once appointed as abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation, there cannot but ariſe an obligation of procuring to have them*, you muſt ſuppoſe I hope, that we know them to be ſo appointed, and that it is in our power to procure them: otherwiſe though it may be our ill fortune to fail of the end, for want of the means, certainly we cannot be obliged to procure them. For the rule of the law is alſo the dictate of common reaſon and equity, That *no man can be obliged to what is impoſſible*. We can be obliged to nothing but by

by vertue of ſome command: now it is impoſſible that God ſhould command in earneſt any thing which he knows to be impoſſible. For to command in earneſt, is to command with an intent to be obeyed; which is not poſſible he ſhould do, when he knows the thing commanded to be impoſſible. Laſtly, whoſoever is obliged to do any thing, and does it not, commits a fault; but Infants commit no fault in not procuring to have Baptiſm, therefore no obligation lies upon them to procure it. 4. Whereas you ſay, that *if Proteſtants diſſent from you in the point of the neceſſity of Baptiſm for Infants, it cannot be denied but that our diſagreement is in a point fundamental*; If you mean a point eſteemed ſo by you, this indeed cannot be denied: But if you mean a point that indeed is fundamental, this may certainly be denied, for I deny it, and ſay, that it doth not appear to me any way neceſſary to Salvation to hold the truth, or not to hold an error, touching the condition of theſe Infants. This is certain, and we muſt believe that God will not deal unjuſtly with them, but how in particular he will deal with them concerns not us, and therefore we need not much regard it. 5. Whereas you ſay the like of your *Sacrament of Pennance*, you only ſay ſo, but your proofs are wanting. Laſtly, whereas you ſay, *This rigour ought not to ſeem ſtrange or unjuſt in God, but that we are rather to bleſs him for ordaining us to Salvation by any means*: I anſwer, that it is true, we are not to queſtion the known will of God of injuſtice; yet whether that which you pretend to be Gods will, be ſo indeed, or only your preſumption, this I hope may be queſtioned lawfully and without preſumption; and if we have occaſion we may ſafely put you in mind of *Ezekiel's* commination, againſt all thoſe who ſay, *thus ſaith the Lord*, when they have no certain warrant or authority from him to do ſo.

8. *Ad* §. 4. In the fourth Paragraph you deliver this falſe and wicked Doctrin, *that for the procuring our own ſalvation we are always bound under pain of mortal ſin, to take the ſafeſt way, but for avoiding ſin we are not bound to do ſo, but may follow the opinion of any probable Doctors*, though the contrary may be certainly free from ſin, and theirs be doubt-

doubtful. Which doctrin in the former part of it is apparently falſe: For though wiſdom and Charity to our ſelves would perſwade us always to do ſo, yet many times, that way which to our ſelves and our ſalvation is more full of hazard, is notwithſtanding not only lawful, but more Charitable and more noble. For example, to flie from a perſecution and ſo to avoid the temptation of it, may be the ſafer way for a mans own ſalvation; yet I preſume no man ought to condemn him of impiety, who ſhould reſolve not to uſe his liberty in this matter; but for Gods greater glory, the greater honour of truth, and the greater confirmation of his brethren in the faith, chooſe to ſtand out the ſtorm and endure the fiery tryal, rather than avoid it; rather to put his own ſoul to the hazard of a temptation, in hope of Gods aſſiſtance to go through with it, than to baulk the opportunity of doing God and his brethren ſo great a ſervice. This part therefore of this Doctrin is manifeſtly untrue. The other not only falſe but impious; for therein you plainly give us to underſtand, that in your judgment, a reſolution to avoid ſin, to the uttermoſt of our power, is no neceſſary means of Salvation, nay that a man may reſolve not to do ſo, without any danger of damnation. Therein you teach us, that we are to do more for the love of our ſelves, and our own happineſs than for the love of God; and in ſo doing contradict our Saviour, who expreſly commands us, *to love the Lord our God with all our heart, with all our ſoul, and with all our ſtrength*; and hath taught us *that the love of God conſiſts in avoiding ſin and keeping his commandments*. Therein you directly croſs S. *Pauls* Doctrin, who though he were a very probable Doctor, and had delivered his judgment for the *lawfulneſs of eating meats offered to Idols*; yet he aſſures us that he which ſhould make ſcruple of doing ſo, and forbear upon his ſcruple, ſhould not ſin, but only be *a weak brother*; whereas he, who ſhould do it with a doubtful conſcience, (though the action were by S. *Paul* warranted lawful, yet) *ſhould ſin and be condemned for ſo doing*. You pretend indeed to be rigid defenders and ſtout champions for the neceſſity of good

good works; but the truth is, *you speak lies in Hypocrisie*, and when the matter is well examined, will appear to make your selves and your own functions necessary, but obedience to God unnecessary: Which will appear to any man who considers what strict necessity the Scripture imposes upon all men, of effectual mortification of the habits of all Vices, and effectual Conversion to newness of Life, and Universal obedience, and withal remembers that an act of Attrition, which you say with Priestly absolution is sufficient to Salvation, is not mortification, which being a work of difficulty and time, cannot be performed in an instant. But for the present, it appears sufficiently out of this impious assertion, which makes it absolutely necessary for men, either in Act if it be possible, or if not, in Desire, to be Baptized and Absolved by you, and that with Intention: and in the mean time warrants them that for avoiding of sin, they may safely follow the uncertain guidance of a vain man, who you cannot deny may either be deceived himself, or out of malice deceive them, and neglect the certain direction of God himself, and their own Consciences. What wicked use is made of this Doctrine, your own long experience can better inform you, than it is possible for me to do: yet my own little conversation with you affords me one memorable example to this purpose. For upon this ground I knew a young Scholar in *Doway*, licensed by a great Casuist to swear a thing as upon his certain knowledge, whereof he had yet no knowledge but only a great presumption, *because* (forsooth) *it was the opinion of one Doctor that he might do so.* And upon the same ground, whensoever you shall come to have a prevailing party in this Kingdom, and power sufficient to restore your Religion, you may do it by deposing or killing the King, by blowing up of Parliaments, and by rooting out all others of a different Faith from you. Nay this you may do, though in your own opinion it be unlawful, because [a] *Bellarmine*, a

[a] *Bellar. Contr. Barcl. c. 7. In 7. c. refutare conatur Barcl. verba illa Romuli. Veteres illos Imperatores Constantium Valentem & Cæteros non ideo toleravit Ecclesia quod legitimè succesissent, sed quod illos sine populi detrimento coercere non poterat. Et miratur hoc idem scripsisse Bellarminum. l. 5. de Pontif. c. 7. Sed ut magis miretur, sciat hoc idem sensisse S. Thomam. 2. 2. q. 12. art. 2. ad 1. Ubi dicit Ecclesiam tolerasse ut fideles obedirent Juliano Apostatæ, quia in sui novitate non-*

dum habebant vires compescendi Principes terrenos. Et postea, Sanctus Gregorius dicit, nullum adversus Juliani persecutionem fuisse remedium præter lacrymas, quoniam non habebat Ecclesia vires quibus illus tyrannidi resistere posset.

man with you of approved Vertue, Learning and Judgment, hath declared his opinion for the lawfulneſs of it, in ſaying, that *want of power to maintain a Rebellion, was the only reaſon that the Primitive Chriſtians did not Rebel againſt the perſecuting Emperors.* By the ſame rule, ſeeing the Prieſts and Scribes and Phariſees, men of greateſt repute among the *Jews* for Vertue, Learning and Wiſdom, held it a lawful and a pious work to perſecute Chriſt and his Apoſtles, it was lawful for the People to follow their Leaders: for herein, according to your Doctrine, they proceeded prudently, and according to the conduct of opinion, maturely weighed and approved by men as it ſeemed to them of Vertue, Learning and Wiſdom; nay by ſuch as ſate in *Moſes* Chair, and of whom it was ſaid, *whatſoever they bid you obſerve, that obſerve and do:* which Univerſal you pretend is to be underſtood Univerſally, and without any reſtriction or limitation. And as lawful was it for the *Pagans* to perſecute the Primitive Chriſtians, becauſe *Trajan* and *Pliny*, men of great Vertue and Wiſdom were of this opinion. Laſtly, that moſt impious and deteſtable Doctrine, (which by a foul calumny you impute to me, who abhor and deteſt it,) that *men may be ſaved in any Religion*, follows from this ground unavoidably. For certainly Religion is one of thoſe things which is neceſſary only becauſe it is commanded: for if none were commanded under pain of damnation, how could it be damnable to be of any? Neither can it be damnable to be of a falſe Religion, unleſs it be a ſin to be ſo. For neither are men ſaved by good luck, but only by obedience; neither are they damned for their ill Fortune but for ſin and diſobedience. Death is the wages of nothing but ſin: and S. *James* ſure intended to deliver the adequate cauſe of ſin and Death in thoſe words, *Luſt when it hath conceived bringeth forth ſin, and ſin when it is finiſhed bringeth forth Death.* Seeing therefore in ſuch things, according to your Doctrine, it is ſufficient for avoiding of ſin, that we proceed prudently, and by the conduct of ſome probable opinion, maturely weighed and approved by men of Learning,

Learning, Vertue and Wisdom: and seeing neither *Jews* want their *Gamaliels*, nor *Pagans* their *Antoninus's* nor any Sect of Christians such professors and maintainers of their several Sects, as are esteemed by the People, which know no better (and that very reasonably) men of Vertue, Learning, and Wisdom, it follows evidently that the embracing their Religion proceeds upon such reason as may warrant their action to be prudent, and this is sufficient for avoiding of sin, and therefore certainly for avoiding damnation, for that in humane affairs, & discourse, evidence and certainty cannot be always expected. I have stood the longer upon the refutation of this Doctrine, not only because it is impious, and because bad use is made of it, and worse may be, but only because the contrary position, *That men are bound for avoiding sin always to take the safest way*, is a fair and sure Foundation, for a clear confutation of the main conclusion, which in this Chapter you labour in vain to prove, and a certain proof that in regard of the precept of Charity towards ones self, and of obedience to God, *Papists* (unless ignorance excuse them) are in state of sin as long as they remain in subjection to the *Roman* Church.

9. for if the safer way for avoiding sin, be also the safer way for avoiding damnation, then certainly the way of *Protestants* must be more secure, and the *Roman* way more dangerous; take but into your consideration these ensuing Controversies: Whether it be lawful to worship Pictures? to Picture the Trinity? to invocate Saints and Angels? to deny Lay-men the Cup in the Sacrament? to adore the Sacraments? to prohibit certain Orders of Men and Women to Marry? to Celebrate the publick service of God in a language which the assistants generally understand not? and you will not choose but confess that in all these you are on the more dangerous side for the committing of sin, and we on that which is more secure. For in all these things, if we say true, you do that which is impious: on the other side if you were in the right, yet we might be secure enough, for we should only not do something which you confess not necessary to be done.

We pretend, and are ready to juſtifie out of principles agreed upon between us, that in all theſe things, you violate the manifeſt commandments of God; and alledge ſuch Texts of Scripture againſt you, as, if you would weigh them with any indifference, would put the matter out of queſtion, but certainly you cannot with any modeſty deny, but that at leaſt they make it queſtionable. On the other ſide, you cannot with any face pretend, and if you ſhould, know not how to go about to prove, that there is any neceſſity of doing any of theſe things; that it is unlawful not to worſhip Pictures, not to Picture the Trinity, not to invocate Saints and Angels, not to give all men the entire Sacrament, not to adore the Euchariſt, not to prohibit Marriage, not to Celebrate Divine Service in an unknown Tongue: I ſay you neither do nor can pretend that there is any law of God which enjoyns us, no nor ſo much as an Evangelical Council that adviſes us to do any of theſe things. Now *where no law is there can be no ſin, for ſin is the tranſgreſſion of the Law*; It remains therefore that our forbearing to do theſe things, muſt be free from all danger and ſuſpicion of ſin; whereas your acting of them, muſt be, if not certainly impious, without all contradiction queſtionable and dangerous. I conclude therefore that which was to be concluded, that if the ſafer way for avoiding ſin, be alſo (as moſt certainly it is,) the ſafer way for avoiding damnation, then certainly the way of *Proteſtants* muſt be more ſafe, and the *Roman* way more dangerous.

12. Ad §. 5.] Here you begin to make ſome ſhew of arguing; and the firſt Argument put into form ſtands thus, *Every leaſt Error in Faith deſtroys the nature of Faith; It is certain that ſome* Proteſtants *do Err, and therefore they want the ſubſtance of Faith.* The Major of which Syllogiſm I have formerly confuted by unanſwerable Arguments out of one of your own beſt Authors, who ſhews plainly that he hath amongſt you, as ſtrange as you make it, many other Abettors. Beſides, if it were true, it would conclude that either you or the *Dominicans* have no Faith, in as much as you oppoſe one another as much as *Arminians* and *Calviniſts*.

13. The

13. The Second Argument stands thus, *Since all* Protestants *pretend the like certainty, it is clear that none of them have any certainty at all:* Which Argument if it were good, then what can hinder but this must also be so, Since *Protestants* and *Papists* pretend the like certainty; it is clear that none of them have any certainty at all! And this too: Since all Christians pretend the like certainty, it is clear that none of them have any certainty at all! And thirdly this: Since men of all Religions pretend a like certainty, it is clear that none of them have any at all! And lastly this: Since oft-times they which are abused with a specious Paralogism, pretend the like certainty with them which demonstrate, it is clear that none of them have any certainty at all! Certainly Sir, Zeal and the Devil did strangely blind you, if you did not see that these horrid impieties were the immediate consequences of your positions, if you did see it, and yet would set them down, you deserve worse censure. Yet such as these, are all the Arguments wherewith you conceive your self to have proved undoubtedly, that *Protestants have reason at least to doubt in what case they stand.*

14. Your third and fourth Argument may be thus put into one; *Protestants cannot tell what points in particular be Fundamental; therefore they cannot tell whether they or their Brethren do not Err Fundamentally, and whether their difference be not Fundamental.* Both which deductions I have formerly shewed to be most inconsequent; for knowing the Scripture to contain all Fundamentals, (though many more points besides, which makes it difficult to say precisely what is Fundamental and what not,) knowing this I say and believing it, what can hinder but that I may be well assured, that I believe all Fundamentals, and that all who believe the Scripture sincerely as well as I, do not differ from me in any thing Fundamental?

15. In the close of this Section, you say, that *you omit to add that we want the Sacrament of Repentance instituted for the remission of sins, or at least we must confess that we hold it not necessary: and yet our own Brethren the Century writers acknowledge that in the times of* Cyprian *and*

and Tertullian, *private Confeſſion even of thoughts was uſed, and that it was then commanded and thought neceſſary; and then our Ordination,* you ſay, *is very doubtful and all that depends upon it.* Anſwer, I alſo omit to anſwer, 1. That your Brother *Rhenanus,* acknowledges the contrary, and aſſures us that the Confeſſion then required and in uſe, was publick, and before the Church, and that your auricular Confeſſion was not then in the World; for which his Mouth is ſtopped by your *Index Expurgatorius.* 2. That your Brother *Arcudius* acknowledges, that the Euchariſt was in *Cyprians* time given to Infants, and eſteemed neceſſary, or at leaſt profitable for them, and the giving it ſhews no leſs; and now I would know whether you will acknowledg your Church bound to give it, and to eſteem ſo of it? 3. That it might be then commanded, and being commanded be thought neceſſary, and yet be but a Church Conſtitution. Neither will I deny, if the preſent Church could, and would ſo order it, that the abuſes of it might be prevented, and conceiving it profitable, ſhould enjoyn the uſe of it, but that being commanded it would be neceſſary. 4. Concerning our Ordinations, beſides that I have proved it impoſſible that they ſhould be ſo doubtful as yours, according to your own principles; I anſwer, that experience ſhews them certainly ſufficient to bring men to Faith and Repentance, and conſequently to Salvation; and that if there were any ſecret defect of any thing neceſſary, which we cannot help, God will certainly ſupply it.

19. It is remarkable againſt what you ſay, §. 7. *That any ſmall Error in Faith deſtroys all Faith,* that S. *Auſtin,* whoſe authority is here ſtood upon, thought otherwiſe: He conceived the *Donatiſts* to hold ſome Error in Faith and yet not to have no Faith. His words of them to this purpoſe are moſt pregnant and evident, *you are with us* (ſaith he to the *Donatiſt.* Ep. 48.) *in Baptiſm, in the Creed, in the other Sacraments:* And again. *Super geſtis cum emerit: Thou haſt proved to me that thou haſt Faith; prove to me likewiſe that thou haſt Charity.* Parallel to which words are theſe of *Optatus, Amongſt us and you is one Eccleſiaſtical con-*

Lib. 5. *prope initium.*

verſation,

versation, common lessons, the same Faith, the same Sacraments. Where by the way we may observe, that in the judgments of these Fathers, even the *Donatists*, though Hereticks and Schismaticks, gave true Ordination, the true Sacrament of Matrimony, true Sacramental Absolution, Confirmation, the true Sacrament of the Eucharist, true extream Unction; or else (choose you whether) some of these were not then esteemed Sacraments. But for Ordination, whether he held it a Sacrament or no, certainly he held that it remained with them entire: for so he says in expres terms, in his Book against *Parmenianus* his Epistle. Which Doctrine if you can reconcile with the present Doctrine of the *Roman* Church, *Eris mihi magnus Apollo.*

20. Ad §. 8.] *Obj.* You say there is *an inevitable necessity for us, either to grant Salvation to your Church, or to entail certain damnation upon our own, because ours can have no being till* Luther, *unless yours be supposed to have been the true Church.* I answer, this cause is no cause: For first, as *Luther* had no being before *Luther*, and yet he was when he was, though he was not before; so there is no repugnance in the terms, but that there might be a true Church after *Luther*, though there were none for some Ages before; as since *Columbus* his time, there have been Christians in *America*, though before there were none for many Ages. For neither do you shew, neither does it appear, that the generation of Churches is Univocal, that nothing but a Church can possibly beget a Church: nor that the present being of a true Church, depends necessarily upon the perpetuity of a Church in all Ages; any more than the present being of Peripateticks or Stoicks depends upon a perpetual pedigree of them. For though I at no hand deny the Churches perpetuity, yet I see nothing in your Book to make me understand, that the truth of the present depends upon it, nor any thing that can hinder, but that a false Church, (Gods providence over-watching and over-ruling it,) may preserve the means of confuting their own Heresies, and reducing men to truth, and so raising a true Church, I mean the integrity and

and the Authority of the word of God with men. Thus the *Jews* preſerve means to make men Chriſtians, and *Papiſts* preſerve means to make men *Proteſtants*, and *Proteſtants* (which you ſay are a falſe Church) do, as you pretend, preſerve means to make men *Papiſts*; that is, their own Bibles, out of which you pretend to be able to prove that they are to be *Papiſts*. Secondly, you ſhew not, nor does it appear that the perpetuity of *the Church* depends on the truth of *yours*. For though you talk vainly, as if you were the only men in the World before *Luther*, yet the World knows that this is but talk, and that there were other Chriſtians beſides you, which might have perpetuated the Church though you had not been. Laſtly, you ſhew not, neither doth it appear, that your being acknowledged in ſome ſenſe a true Church, doth neceſſarily import, that we muſt grant Salvation to it, unleſs by it you underſtand the ignorant members of it, which is a very unuſual *Synechdoche*.

21. Whereas you ſay, *that Catholicks never granted that the* Donatiſts *had a true Church or might be ſaved.* I anſw. S. *Auſtin* himſelf granted that thoſe among them, who ſought the Truth, being *ready when they found it to correct their Error were not Hereticks, and therefore notwithſtanding their Error might be ſaved.* And this is all the Charity that *Proteſtants* allow to *Papiſts*.

Therefore the Argument of the *Donatiſts*, is as good as that of the *Papiſts* againſt *Proteſtants*. For the *Donatiſts* argued thus, ſpeaking to the *Catholicks*, *Your ſelves confeſs our Baptiſm, Sacraments and Faith good and available. We deny yours to be ſo, and ſay there is no Church, no Salvation amongſt you*; *Therefore it is ſafeſt for all to joyn with us.*

22. S. *Auſtins* words are (cont. lit. petil. l. 2. c. 108.) *Petilianus dixit, venite ad Eccleſiam populi & aufugite Traditores, ſi perire non vultis*: Petilian *ſaith, come to the Church ye People, and fly from the Traditours, if ye will not be damned*; *for that ye may know that they being guilty, eſteem well of our Faith, behold I Baptize theſe whom they have infected, but they receive thoſe whom we have Baptized.* Where

Cont. lit. Petil. l. 2. c. 108.

it

it is plain, that *Petilian* by his words makes the *Donatists* the Church, and excludes the *Catholicks* from salvation absolutely. And whereas you say, *the* Catholicks *never yielded that among the* Donatists *there was a true Church and hope of Salvation,* I say it appears by what I have alledged out of S. *Austin,* that they yielded both these were among the *Donatists,* as much as we yield them to be among the *Papists.* As for D. *Potters* acknowledgment, *that they maintained an error in the matter and nature of it Heretical:* This proves them but material Hereticks, whom you do not exclude from possibility of Salvation. So that all things considered, this argument must be much more forcible from the *Donatists* against the *Catholicks,* than from *Papists* against *Protestants,* in regard *Protestants* grant *Papists* no more hope of salvation than *Papists* grant *Protestants*: whereas the *Donatists* excluded absolutely all but their own part from hope of Salvation, so far as to account them no Christians that were not of it: the Catholicks mean while accounting them Brethren, and freeing those among them, from the imputation of Heresie, who being in error *quærebant cautâ sollicitudine veritatem corrigi parati cùm invenerint*; *sought for truth carefully, being ready when they found it to correct their errors.*

23. Whereas you say, *That the Argument for the certainty of their Baptism (because it was confessed good by Catholicks, whereas the Baptism of Catholicks was not confessed by them to be good,) is not so good as yours, touching the certainty of your Salvation grounded on the confession of Protestants, because we confess there is no damnable error in the doctrin or practice of the* Roman *Church:* I Answer, no: we confess no such matter, and though you say so a hundred times, no repetition will make it true. We profess plainly, that many damnable errors plainly repugnant to the precepts of Christ both Ceremonial and Moral, more plainly than this of Rebaptization, and therefore more damnable, are believed and professed by you. And therefore seeing this is the only disparity you can devise, and this is vanished, it remains that as good an answer as the Catholicks made touching the certainty of their Baptism, as good may we

make, and with much more evidence of Reaſon, touching the ſecurity and certainty of our Salvation.

24. By the way I deſire to be informed, ſeeing you affirm that *Rebaptizing thoſe whom Hereticks had baptized was a ſacriledge, and a profeſſion of a damnable Hereſie,* when it began to be ſo? If from the beginning it were ſo, then was *Cyprian* a ſacrilegious profeſſor of a damnable hereſie, and yet a Saint and a Martyr. If it were not ſo, then did your Church excommunicate *Firmilian* and others, and ſeparate from them without ſufficient ground of Excommunication or Separation, which is Schiſmatical. You ſee what difficulties you run into on both ſides; chooſe whether you will, but certainly both can hardly be avoided.

27. What S. *Auſtin* anſwers to the *Donatiſts* argument, fits us in anſwer to yours, as if it had been made for it; for as S. *Auſtin* ſays, *that Catholicks approve the Doctrin of* Donatiſts, *but abhor their Hereſie of Re-baptization:* So we ſay, that we approve thoſe fundamental and ſimple neceſſary Truths which you retain, by which ſome good ſouls among you may be ſaved, but abhor your many Superſtitions and Hereſies. And as he ſays, that as gold is good, yet ought not to be ſought for among a company of thieves, and Baptiſm good but not to be ſought for in the Conventicles of *Donatiſts:* ſo ſay we, that the Truths you retain are good, and as we hope ſufficient to bring good ignorant ſouls among you to ſalvation, yet are not to be ſought for in the Conventicle of *Papiſts,* who hold with them a mixture of many vanities, and many impieties.

30. Obj. *But* Proteſtants *do either exclude Hope by Deſpair, with the Doctrin that our Saviour died not for all, and that ſuch want grace ſufficient to ſalvation; or elſe by vain* preſumption *grounded upon a fantaſtical perſwaſion that they are predeſtinate, which Faith muſt exclude all fear and trembling;* and you add, *though ſome* Proteſtants *may relent from the rigour of the aforeſaid doctrin, yet none of them can have true hope while they hope to be ſaved in the Communion of thoſe, who defend ſuch Doctrins.*

Anſ.

Ans. * All this may be as forcibly returned upon Papists, as it is urged against Protestants; in as much as all Papists either hold the Doctrine of Predetermination and absolute Election, or Communicate with those that do hold it. Now from this Doctrin what is more prone and obvious, than for every natural man (without Gods especial preventing grace) to make this practical collection; either I am elected, or not elected; if I be, no impiety possible can ever damn me: If not, no possible industry can ever save me? Now whether this disjunctive perswasion be not as likely (as any doctrin of Protestants) to extinguish Christian Hope and filial fear, and to lead some men to despair, others to presumption, all to a wretchless and impious life, I desire you ingenuously to inform me; and if you deny it, assure your self, you shall be contradicted and confuted, by men of your own Religion and your own society; and taught at length this charitable doctrin, that though mens opinions may be charged with the absurd consequences which naturally flow from them, yet the men themselves are not; I mean, if they perceive not the consequence of these absurdities, nor do not own and acknowledge, but disclaim and detest them.

* *See numb.* 4. *in the* fol. edit.

I add 1. That there is no *Calvinist* that will deny the truth of this proposition, *Christ died for all*, nor to subscribe to that sense of it, which your Dominicans put upon it; neither can you with coherence to the received Doctrine of your own Society, deny that they as well as the *Calvinists*, take away the distinction of sufficient and effectual grace, and indeed hold none to be sufficient, but only that which is effectual. 2. Whereas you say, *They cannot make their calling certain by good works, who do certainly believe that before any good works they are justified, and justified by faith alone, and by that faith whereby they certainly believe they are justified:* I answer, There is no *Protestant* but believes that Faith, Repentance, and universal Obedience, are necessary to the obtaining of Gods favour and eternal happiness. This being granted, the rest is but a speculative Controversie, a Question about words which would quickly vanish, but that men affect not to under-

ſtand one another. As if a company of Phyſicians were in conſultation, and ſhould all agree, that three Medicins and no more were neceſſary for the recovery of the Patients health, this were ſufficient for his direction towards the recovery of his health; though concerning the proper and ſpecifical effects of theſe three Medicins, there ſhould be amongſt them as many differences as men: So likewiſe being generally at accord that theſe three things, Faith, Hope, and Charity, are neceſſary to ſalvation, ſo that whoſoever wants any of them cannot obtain it, and he which hath them all cannot fail of it, is it not very evident that they are ſufficiently agreed for mens directions to eternal Salvation? And ſeeing Charity is a full comprehenſion of all good works, they requiring Charity as a neceſſary qualification in him that will be ſaved, what ſenſe is there in ſaying, *they cannot make their calling certain by good works?* They know what ſalvation is as well as you, and you have as much reaſon to deſire it: They believe it as heartily as you, that there is no good work but ſhall have its proper reward, and that there is no poſſibility of obtaining the eternal reward without good works: and why then may not this Doctrin be a ſufficient incitement and provocation unto good works?

31. You ſay, that *they certainly believe that before any good works they are juſtified:* But this is a calumny. There is no *Proteſtant* but requires to Juſtification, Remiſſion of ſins, and to Remiſſion of ſins they all require Repentance, and Repentance I preſume may not be denied the name of a good work, being indeed, if it be rightly underſtood, and according to the ſenſe of the word in Scripture, an effectual converſion from all ſin to all holineſs. But though it be taken for meer ſorrow for ſins paſt, and a bare purpoſe of amendment, yet even this is a good work, and therefore Proteſtants requiring this to Remiſſion of ſins, and Remiſſion of ſins to juſtification, cannot with candor be pretended to believe, that they are juſtified before any good work.

32. Obj. You ſay, *They believe themſelves juſtified by faith alone, and that by that faith whereby they believe themſelves juſtified:* *Anſ.*

Answ. Some peradventure do so, but withal they believe that that faith which is alone, and unaccompanied with *sincere* and universal obedience, is to be esteemed not faith but presumption, and is at no hand sufficient to justification: that though Charity be not imputed unto justification, yet it is required as a necessary disposition in the person to be justified, and that though in regard of the imperfection of it, no man can be justified by it, yet that on the other side, no man can be justified without it. So that upon the whole matter, a man may truly and safely say, that the Doctrin of these Protestants taken altogether, is not a Doctrin of Liberty, not a Doctrin that turns hope into presumption, and carnal security, though it may justly be feared, that many licentious persons, taking it by halves, have made this wicked use of it. For my part, I do heartily wish, that by publick Authority it were so ordered, that no man should ever Preach or Print this Doctrin that Faith alone justifies, unless he joyns this together with it, that universal obedience is necessary to salvation. And besides that those Chapters of S. *Paul* which intreat of justification by faith, without the works of the Law, were never read in the Church, but when the thirteenth Chapter of the first Epistle to the *Corinthians* concerning the absolute neceffity of Charity should be, to prevent misprision, read together with them.

33. Obj. Whereas you say, that *some Protestants do expressly affirm the former point to be the soul of the Church*, &c. *and that therefore they must want the Theological vertue of Hope, and that none can have true hope, while they hope to be saved in their Communion.*

I *Answer*, They have great reason to believe the Doctrin of Justification by faith only, a point of great weight and importance, if it be rightly understood: that is, they have reason to esteem it a principal and necessary duty of a Christian, to place his hope of justification and salvation, not in the perfection of his own righteousness (which if it be imperfect will not justifie,) but only in the mercies of God through Christs satisfaction: and yet notwithstanding this, nay the rather for this, may preserve themselves

ſelves in the right temper of good Chriſtians, which is a happy mixture and ſweet compoſition of confidence and fear. If this Doctrin be otherwiſe expounded than I have here expounded, I will not undertake the juſtification of it, only I will ſay (that which I may do truly) that I never knew any Proteſtant ſuch a ſoli-fidian, but that he did believe theſe divine Truths; *That he muſt make his calling certain by good works: That he muſt work out his ſalvation with fear and trembling, and that while he does not ſo, he can have no well-grounded hope of Salvation*: I ſay I never met with any who did not believe theſe divine Truths, and that with a more firm, and a more unſhaken aſſent, than he does that himſelf is predeſtinate, and that he is juſtified by believing himſelf juſtified. I never met with any ſuch, who if he ſaw there were a neceſſity to do either, would not rather forgo his belief of theſe Doctrins than the former: theſe which he ſees diſputed and contradicted and oppoſed with a great multitude of very potent Arguments; then thoſe, which being the expreſs words of Scripture, whoſoever ſhould call into queſtion, could not with any modeſty pretend to the title of Chriſtian. And therefore there is no reaſon but we may believe, that their full aſſurance of the former Doctrins doth very well qualifie their perſwaſion of the latter, and that the former (as alſo the lives of many of them do ſufficiently teſtifie) are more effectual to temper their hope, and to keep it at a ſtay of a filial and modeſt aſſurance of Gods favor, built upon the conſcience of his love and fear, than the latter can be to ſwell and puff them up into vain confidence and ungrounded preſumption. This reaſon, joyned with our experience of the honeſt and religious converſation of many men of this opinion, is a ſufficient ground for Charity, to hope well of their hope: and to aſſure our ſelves that it cannot be offenſive, but rather moſt acceptable to God, if notwithſtanding this diverſity of opinion, we embrace each ether with the ſtrict embraces of love and Communion. To you and your Church we leave it, to ſeparate Chriſtians from the Church, and to preſcribe them from heaven upon trivial and trifling cauſes: As for

our

our selves, we conceive a charitable judgment of our Brethren and their errors, though untrue, much more pleasing to God than a true judgment, if it be uncharitable; and therefore shall always chuse (if we do err) to err on the milder and more merciful part, and rather to retain those in our Communion which deserve to be ejected, than eject those that deserve to be retained.

34. Lastly, whereas you say, that *seeing Protestants differ about the point of Justification, you must needs infer that they want unity in faith, and consequently all faith, and then that they cannot agree what points are fundamental:* I Answer, to the first of these inferences, that as well might you infer it upon *Victor* Bishop of *Rome* and *Policrates*; upon *Stephen* Bishop of *Rome* and S. *Cyprian*: inasmuch as it is undeniably evident, that what one of those esteemed necessary to salvation the other esteemed not so. But points of Doctrin (as all other things) are as they are, and not as they are esteemed: neither can a necessary point be made unnecessary by being so accounted, nor an unnecessary point be made necessary by being overvalued. But as the ancient Philosophers, (whose different opinions about the soul of man you may read in *Aristotle de Anima*, and *Cicero's Tusculan Questions*,) notwithstanding their divers opinions touching the nature of the soul, yet all of them had souls, and souls of the same nature: Or as those Physicians who dispute whether the brain or heart be the principal part of a man, yet all of them have brains and have hearts, and herein agree sufficiently: So likewise, though some Protestants esteem that Doctrin the soul of the Church, which others do not so highly value, yet this hinders not but that which is indeed the soul of the Church may be in both sorts of them; and though one account that a necessary truth which others account neither necessary nor perhaps true, yet this notwithstanding, in those Truths which are truly and really necessary they may all agree. For no Argument can be more sophistical than this: They differ in some points which they esteem necessary; Therefore they differ in some that indeed and in truth are so.

35. Now

35. Now as concerning the other inference, *That they cannot agree what points are fundamental:* I have ſaid and proved formerly that there is no ſuch neceſſity as you imagin or pretend, that men ſhould certainly know what is, and what is not fundamental. They that believe all things plainly delivered in Scripture, believe all things fundamental, and are at ſufficient Unity in matters of Faith, though they cannot preciſely and exactly diſtinguiſh between what is fundamental and what is profitable: nay though by error they miſtake ſome vain, or perhaps hurtful opinions for neceſſary and fundamental Truths. Beſides, I have ſhewed above, that as Proteſtants do not agree (for you over-reach in ſaying they cannot) touching what points are fundamental; ſo neither do you agree what points are defined and ſo to be accounted, and what are not: nay, nor concerning the ſubject in which God hath placed this pretended Authority of defining: ſome of you ſetling it in the Pope himſelf, though alone without a Council: Others in a Council, though divided from the Pope: Others only in the conjunction of Council and Pope: Others not in this neither, but in the acceptation of the preſent Church Univerſal: Laſtly, others not attributing it to this neither, but only to the perpetual Succeſſion of the Church of all Ages: of which divided Company it is very evident and undeniable, that every former may be and are obliged to hold many things defined and therefore neceſſary, which the latter, according to their own grounds, have no obligation to do, nay cannot do ſo upon any firm and ſure and infallible foundation.

Cap. 3. §. 53. & *alibi.*

FINIS.

OUT OF

Mr. *Chillingworth's* Manuscript.

A LETTER TO

Mr. LEWGAR,

CONCERNING THE

Church of Romes

Being the Guide of Faith and Judge of Controversies.

Good Mr. LEWGAR,

THough I am resolved not to be much afflicted for the loss of that which is not in my power to keep, yet I cannot deny, but the loss of a friend goes very near unto my heart: and by this name of a friend, I did presume till of late, that I might have called you, because, though perhaps for want of power and opportunity, I have done you no good office, yet I have been always willing and ready to do you the best service I could: and therefore I cannot but admire at that affected strangeness which, in your last Letter to me, you seem to take upon you, renouncing in a manner all relation to me, and tacitly excommunicating me from all interest in you: the *Superscription* of your

Letter is to Mr. *William Chillingworth*, and your *Subscription John Lewgar*, as if you either disdained or made a conscience of stiling me your friend, or your self mine. If this proceed from passion and weakness, I pray mend it; if from reason I pray shew it: If you think me one of those to whom Saint *John* forbids you to say *God save you*, then you are to think and prove me one of those Deceivers which deny Christ Jesus to be *come in the flesh*. If you think me an Heretick and therefore to be avoided, you must prove me αὐτοκατάκριτον, condemned by my own judgment; which I know I cannot, and therefore I think you cannot: If you say I *do not hear the Church*, and therefore am to be esteemed an *Heathen* or *Publican*; you are to prove that by the Church there is meant the Church of *Rome:* and yet when you have done so, I hope Christians are not forbidden to shew humanity and civility, even to *Pagans:* for Gods sake, Mr. *Lewgar*, free your self from this blind zeal, at least for a little space; and consider with reason and moderation what strange crime you can charge me with, that should deserve this strange usage, especially from you: Is it a crime to endeavour with all my understanding to find your Religion true, and to make my self a believer of it, and not be able to do so? Is it a crime to imploy all my reason upon the justification of the Infallibility of the *Roman* Church, and to find it impossible to be justified? I will call God to witness, who knows my heart better than you do, that I have evened the scale of my judgment as much as possibly I could, and have not willingly allowed any one grain of worldly motives on either side; but have weighed the Reasons for your Religion and against with such indifference, as if there were nothing in the world but God and my self; and is it my fault, that that scale goes down which hath the most weight in it? that that building falls, which has a false foundation? have you such power over your understanding, that you can believe what you please, though you see no reason, or that you can suspend your belief when you do see reason? If you have, I pray for our old

friend-

friendſhips ſake teach me that trick; but until I have learnt it, I pray blame me not for going the ordinary way; I mean for believing or not believing as I ſee reaſon: If you can convince me of wilful oppoſition againſt the known truth, of negligence in ſeeking it, of unwillingneſs to find it, of preferring temporal reſpects before it, or of any other fault, which is in my power to amend, that is indeed a fault, if I amend it not, be as angry with me as you pleaſe. But to impute to me involuntary errors; or that I do not ſee that which I would ſee, but cannot; or that I will not profeſs that which I do not believe; certainly this is far more unreaſonable error, than any which you can juſtly charge me with; for let me tell you, the imputing *Socinianiſm* to me, whoſoever was the author of it, was a wicked and groundleſs ſlander.

Perhaps you will ſay, for this is the uſual ſong on that ſide, that pride is a voluntary fault, and with this I am juſtly chargeable for forſaking that guide which God has appointed me to follow: But what if I forſook it, becauſe I thought I had reaſon to fear, it was one of thoſe blind guides which whoſoever blindly follows, is threatned by our Saviour that both he and his guide ſhall fall into the Ditch; then I hope you will grant it was not pride, but Conſcience that moved me to do ſo; for as it is wiſe humility to obey thoſe whom God hath ſet over me, ſo it is ſinful credulity to follow every man or every Church, that without warrant will take upon them to guide me: ſhew me then ſome good and evident title which the Church of *Rome* has to this office, produce but one reaſon for it which upon trial will not finally be reſolved and vaniſh into uncertainties; and if I yield not unto it, ſay if you pleaſe I am as proud as Lucifer: in the mean time give me leave to think it ſtrange and not far from a Prodigee, that this Doctrin of the *Roman* Churches being the guide of faith, if it be true doctrin, ſhould either not be known to the four Evangeliſts, or if it were known to them, that being wiſe and good men, they ſhould either

be ſo envious of the Churches happineſs; or ſo forgetful of the work they took in hand, which was to write the Goſpel of Chriſt, as that not ſo much as one of them ſhould mention ſo much as once, this ſo neceſſary part of the Goſpel, without the belief whereof there is no ſalvation, and with the belief whereof, unleſs men be ſnatcht away by ſudden death, there is hardly any damnation. It is evident they do all of them, with one conſent, ſpeak very plainly of many things of no importance in compariſon hereof: and is it credible or indeed poſſible that with one conſent or rather conſpiracy, they ſhould be ſo deeply ſilent concerning this *unum neceſſarium?* You may believe it if you can, for my part I cannot, unleſs I ſee demonſtration for it: for if you ſay they ſend us to the Church, and conſequently to the Church of *Rome*: this is to ſuppoſe that which can never be proved, that the Church of *Rome* is the only Church; and without this ſuppoſal, upon Diviſion of the Church, I am as far to ſeek for a guide of my Faith as ever. As for example,

In that great diviſion of the Church when the whole world wondred, ſaith Saint *Hierom*, that it was become *Arrian*: when *Liberius* Biſhop of *Rome* (as S. *Athanaſius*, and S. *Hilary* teſtifie) ſubſcribed their Hereſie, and joyned in Communion with them: Or in the diviſion between the *Greek* and the *Roman* Church, about the proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt, when either ſide was the Church to it ſelf, and each part Heretical and Schiſmatical to the other; what direction could I then an ignorant man have found from that Text of Scripture, *Unleſs he hear the Church, let him be to thee as a Heathen or a Publican:* or *Upon this Rock will I build my Church and the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt it.*

Again, give me leave to wonder, that neither S. *Paul* writing to the *Romans* ſhould ſo much as intimate this their priviledge of Infallibility, but rather on the contrary put them in fear in the eleventh Chapter, that they as well as the Jews were in danger of falling away.

That

That Saint *Peter*, the pretended Bishop of *Rome*, writing two Catholick Epistles, mentioning his departure, should not once acquaint the Christians whom he writes to, what guide they were to follow, after he was taken from them.

That the writers of the New Testament, should so frequently forewarn men of Hereticks, false Christs, false prophets, and not once arm them against them, with letting them know this onely sure means of avoiding their danger.

That so great a part of the New Testament should be imployed about Antichrist, and so little or indeed none at all, about the Vicar of Christ, and the guide of the faithful.

That our Saviour should leave this onely means for the ending of Controversies, and yet speak so obscurely and ambiguously of it, that now our Judge is the greatest Controversie, and the greatest hinderance of ending them.

That there should be better evidence in the Scripture to intitle the *King* to this Office who disclaims it, than the *Pope* who pretends it.

That S. *Peter* should not ever exercise over the Apostles, any one act of Jurisdiction, nor they ever give him any one Title of Authority over them.

That if the Apostles did know S. *Peter* was made head over them, when our Saviour said, *Thou art Peter*, &c. they should still contend who should be the first; and that our Saviour should never tell them S. *Peter* was the man.

That S. *Paul* should say, he was in nothing inferiour to the very chief Apostles.

That the Catechumenists in the primitive Church should never be taught this foundation of their Faith, that the Church of *Rome* was Guide of their Faith.

That the Fathers, *Tertullian*, S. *Hierom* and *Optatus*, when they flew highest in commendation of the *Roman* Church, should attribute no more to her than to all other Apostolical Churches.

That

That in the Controverſie about *Eaſter*, the Biſhops and Churches of *Aſia*, ſhould be ſo ill Catechiſed as not to know this Principle of Chriſtian Religion——The neceſſity of Conformity in Doctrin with the Church of *Rome*. That they ſhould never be preſſed with any ſuch neceſſity of conformity in all things, but onely with the Tradition of the Weſtern Churches in that point.

That *Irenæus* and many other Biſhops (notwithſtanding *ad hanc Eccleſiam neceſſe eſt omnem convenire Eccleſiam*) ſhould not yet think that a neceſſary Doctrin, nor a ſufficient ground of Excommunication, which the Church of *Rome* thought to be ſo.

That S. *Cyprian* and the Biſhops of *Africk*, ſhould be ſo ill inſtructed in their Faith, as not to know this foundation of it. That they likewiſe were never urged with any ſuch neceſſity of Conformity with the Church of *Rome*, nor ever charged with hereſie or error for denying it.

That when *Liberius* joyned in Communion with the *Arrians* and ſubſcribed their hereſie, the *Arrians* then ſhould not be the Church, and the Guide of Faith.

That never any Hereticks for three Ages after Chriſt, were preſſed with this Argument of the Infallibility of the preſent Church of *Rome*, or charged with denyal of it, as a diſtinct Hereſie; ſo that *Æneas Sylvius* ſhould have cauſe to ſay, *Ante tempora Concilii Niceni, quiſq; ſibi vivebat, & parvus reſpectus habebatur ad Eccleſiam Romanam.* That the Eccleſiaſtical Story of thoſe times mentions no Acts of Authority of the Church of *Rome* over other Churches; as if there ſhould be a Monarchy, and the Kings for ſome Ages together ſhould exerciſe no act of Juriſdiction in it.

That to ſupply this defect, the Decretal Epiſtles ſhould be ſo impudently forged, which in a manner ſpeak nothing elſe but *Reges & Monarchas*; I mean, the Popes making Laws for exerciſing authority over all other Churches.

That the *African* Churches in S. *Auſtins* time ſhould be ignorant that the Pope was Head of the Church and Judge of Appeals *jure divino*; and that there was a neceſſity

ceſſity of Conformity with the Church, in this and all other points of Doctrin.

Nay that the *Popes* themſelves ſhould be ſo ignorant of the true ground of this their Authority, as to pretend to it, not upon Scripture or univerſal Tradition, but upon an imaginary pretended none-ſuch Canon of the Council of *Nice*.

That *Vincentius Lirinenſis* ſeeking for a guide of his Faith and a preſervative from Hereſie, ſhould be ignorant of this ſo ready one, The Infallibility of the Church of *Rome*.

All theſe things and many more are very ſtrange to me, if the Infallibility of the *Roman* Church be indeed and were always by Chriſtians acknowledged the foundation of our Faith: And therefore I beſeech you pardon me, if I chooſe to build mine, upon one that is much firmer and ſafer, and lies open to none of theſe objections, which is Scripture and univerſal Tradition; and if one that is of this Faith may have leave to do ſo; I will ſubſcribe with hand and heart,

Your very loving and true Friend

W. C.

A TABLE

A TABLE OF Contents.

Note that the firſt Figure refers to the Chapter, the other to the diviſions of each Chapter.

A.

PRoteſtants *agree* in more things than they differ in, by believing the Scripture. *chap.* 4. *div.* 49. 50.

We have as many rational means of *Agreement* as the Papiſts. *c.* 3. 7, 8.

Papiſts pretend to means of *agreement*, and do not agree. *c.* 3. 3,4,5,6.

Not neceſſary to find a Church *agreeing* with Proteſtants in all points. Anſ. pref. 19. & *c.* 5.27.

Antiquity vainly pleaded for *Romiſh* Doctrins and Practices, ſince many Errors are more ancient than ſome of their Doctrins. *c.* 5. 91.

The *Apoſtolick* Church an Infallible Guide to which we may reſort, being preſent to us by her Writings. *c.* 3. 69, 80.

That the Church has power to make new *Articles* of Faith, aſſerted by the *Romiſh* Doctors. *c.* 4. 18.

This one *Article*, I *believe the Roman Catholick Church to be Infallible*, if their Doctrin were true, would ſecure againſt hereſie, more than the whole Creed. *c.* 4. 77, 78, 79, 83.

Chriſts *aſſiſtance* promiſed to the Church, to lead her into more than neceſſary truths. *c.* 5. 61, 62.

Atheiſm and irreligion ſprings eaſily from ſome *Romiſh* Doctrins and Practices. *Pref.* 7, 8.

S. *Auſtins* ſaying, *Evangelio non crederem*, &c. how to be underſtood. *c.* 2. 54, 97, 98, 99.
S. *Auſtins* Teſtimony againſt the *Donatiſts*, not cogent againſt *Proteſtants*. *c.* 2. 163.
S. *Auſtins* words, *No neceſſity to divide unity*, explained. *c.* 5. 10.
The *Authors* vindication from ſuſpition of Hereſie. *Pref.* 28.
The *Authors* motives to turn a Papiſt, with anſwers to them. *Pref.* 42. 43.

B.

The *Bible* which is the Religion of Proteſtants, to be preferred before the way of *Romiſh* Religion, ſhewed at large. *c.* 6. from 56. to 72. Incluſive.

C.

The *Calviniſts* rigid Doctrin of Predetermination, unjuſtly reproached by Papiſts, who communicate with thoſe that hold the ſame. *c.* 7. 30.
To give a *Catalogue* of our Fundamentals not neceſſary nor poſſible. *Anſ. Pref.* 27. & *c.* 3. 13, 53.
Want of ſuch a *Catalogue*, leaves us not uncertain in our Faith. *c.* 3. 14.
Papiſts as much bound to give a *Catalogue* of the Churches propoſals, which are their Fundamentals, and yet do it not. *c.* 3. 53.
Our general *Catalogue* of Fundamentals as good as theirs. *c.* 4. 12. *c.* 7. 35.
Moral *certainty* a ſufficient Foundation of Faith. *c.* 2. 154.
A Proteſtant may have *certainty*, though diſagreeing Proteſtants all pretend to like certainty. *c.* 7. 13.
What *Charity* Papiſts allow to us Proteſtants, and we to them. *c.* 1. 1, 3, 4, 5.
A *Charitable* judgment ſhould be made of ſuch as err, but lead good lives. *c.* 7. 33.
Proteſtant *Charity* to Ignorant Papiſts; no comfort to them that will not ſee their errors. *c.* 5. 76.
The *Church* how furniſhed with means to determin Controverſies. *c.* 1. 7, 11.
Commands in Scripture to hear the Church and obey it, ſuppoſe it not infallible. *c.* 3. 41.
We may be a *true Church*, though deriving Ordination and receiving Scripture from a falſe one. *c.* 6. 54.
Common truths believed, may preſerve them good that otherwiſe err. *c.* 7. 33.
Conſcience in ſome caſes will juſtifie ſeparation, though every pretence of it will not. *c.* 5. 108.
Concord in damned errors, worſe than diſagreement in controverted points *c.* 5. 72.
The *Conſequences* of mens Opinions, may be unjuſtly charged upon them. *c.* 1. 12. *c.* 7. 30.
What *Contradictions* Papiſts believe, who hold Tranſubſtantiation. *c.* 4. 46.

All

All *Controverſies* in Religion not neceſſary to be determined. *c.* 1.7,156. & *c.* 3.88.

How *Controverſies* about Scripture it ſelf are to be decided. *c.* 2. 27.

Controverſies not neceſſary to be decided by a Judicial ſentence, without any appeal. *c.* 2. 85.

That the *Creed* contains all neceſſary points, and how to be underſtood. *c.* 4. 23, 73, 74.

Not neceſſary that our *Creed* ſhould be larger than that of the Apoſtles. *c.* 4.67,70,71,72.

Whether it be contrary to the *Creed*, to ſay the Church may fail. *c.* 5.31.

D.

S *Dennis* of *Alexandria*'s ſaying explained, about not dividing the Church. *c.* 5. 12.

To *deny* a Truth witneſſed by God, whether always damnable —— *Anſ. Pref.* 9.

The Apoſtles *depoſiting* Truth with the Church, no argument that ſhe ſhould always keep it ſincere and intire. *c.* 2. 148.

Of *Diſagreeing* Proteſtants, though one ſide muſt err, yet both may hope for ſalvation. *Anſ. Pref.* 22. & *c.* 1. 10, 13, 17.

Two may *diſagree* in a matter of faith, and yet neither be chargeable with denying a declared Truth of Gods. *Anſ. Pref.* 10.

Differences among Proteſtants vainly objected againſt them. *c.* 3.2,3,5. & *c.* 5. 72.

No reaſon to reproach them for their *differences* about neceſſary Truths and damnable Errors. *c.* 3. 52.

What is requiſite to convince a man that a *Doctrin* comes from God. *Anſ. Pref.* 8.

Believing the *Doctrin* of Scripture, a man may be ſaved, though he did not believe it to be the word of God. *c.* 2. 159.

The *Donatiſts* error about the Catholick Church, what it was and was not. *c.* 3. 64.

The *Donatiſts* caſe and ours not alike. *c.* 5. 103.

The *Roman* Church guilty of the *Donatiſts* Error, in perſwading men as good not to be Chriſtians, as not *Roman* Catholicks. *c.* 3. 64.

Papiſts like to the *Donatiſts* than we, by their uncharitable denying ſalvation out of their Church. *c.* 7. 21, 22, 27.

E.

Engliſh Divines vindicated from inclining to Popery, and for want of skill in School-Divinity. *Pref.* 19.

How *Errors* may be damnable. *Anſ. Pref.* 22.

In what caſe *Errors* damnable, may not damn thoſe that hold them. *c.* 5. 58. & *c.* 6. 14.

In what caſe *Errors* not damnable, may be damnable to thoſe that hold them. *c.* 5. 66.

No man to be reproached for quitting his *Errors*. *c*. 5. 103.
Though we may pardon the *Roman* Church for her *Errors*, yet we may not ſin with it. *c*. 5. 70.
Errors of the *Roman* Church that endanger ſalvation to be forſaken, though they are not deſtructive of it. *c*. 7. 6.
Erring perſons that lead good lives, ſhould be judged of charitably. *c*. 7. 33.
A man may learn of the Church to confute its *Errors*. *c*. 3. 40.
We did well to forſake the *Roman* Church for her *Errors*, though we afterwards may err out of it. *c*. 5. 63, 64, 65, 67, 87, 92.
We muſt not adhere to a Church in profeſſing the leaſt *Errors*, leſt we ſhould not profeſs with her neceſſary Doctrin. *c*. 3. 56.
The *Examples* of thoſe that forſaking Popiſh Errors, have denied neceſſary Truths, no Argument againſt Proteſtants. *c*. 3. 63.
External Communion of a Church may be left without leaving a Church. *c*. 5. 32, 45, 47.

F.

Whether *Faith* be deſtroyed, by denying a Truth teſtified by God. *Anſ. Pref*. 25. *c*. 6. 49. *c*. 7. 19.
The Objects of *Faith* of two ſorts, eſſential and occaſional. *c*. 4. 3.
Certainty of *Faith* leſs than the higheſt degree, may pleaſe God and ſave a man. *c*. 1. 8. & 6. 3, 4, 5.
Faith leſs than infallibly certain may reſiſt temptations & difficulties. *c*. 6. 5.
There may be *Faith* where the Church and its infallibility begets it not. *c*. 2. 49.
Faith does not go before Scripture, but follows its efficacy. *c*. 2. 48.
Proteſtants have ſufficient means to know the certainty of their *Faith* *c*. 2. 152.
In the *Roman* Church, the laſt reſolution of *Faith* is into Motives of Credibility. *c*. 2. 154.
The *Fathers* declared their Judgment of Articles, but did not require their declarations to be received under Anathema. *c*. 4. 18.
Proteſtants did not *forſake* the Church, though they forkſook its errors. *c*. 3. 11.
Sufficient *Foundation* for faith without infallible certainty. *c*. 6. 6, 45.
What Proteſtants mean by *Fundamental Doctrins*. *c*. 4. 52.
In what ſenſe the Church of *Rome* errs not *Fundamentally*. *Anſ. Pref*. 20.
To be unerring in *Fundamentals*, can be ſaid of no Church of one denomination. *c* 3. 55.
To ſay that there ſhall be always a Church not erring in *Fundamentals*, is to ſay that there ſhall be always a Church. *c*. 3. 55.
A Church is not ſafe, though retaining *Fundamentals*, when it builds hay and ſtubble on the foundation, and neglects to reform her Errors. *c*. 5. 61.
Ignorance of what points in particular are *fundamental*, does not make it uncertain whether we do not err fundamentally, or differ in fundamentals among our ſelves. *c*. 7. 14.

G.

G.

The four *Goſpels* contain all neceſſary Doctrins. *c.* 4.40,41,42,43.
An *Infallible Guide* not neceſſary for avoiding Hereſie. *c.* 2. 127.
The Apoſtolick Church an *Infallible Guide* to which we may reſort. *c.* 3.69.
The Church may not be an *Infallible Guide* in fundamentals, though it be infallible in fundamentals. *c.* 3.39.
That the *Roman* Church ſhould be the only *infallible Guide* of Faith, and the Scriptures ſay nothing concerning it, is incredible. *c.* 6. 20.

H.

The difference betwixt *Hereſie* and Schiſm. *c.* 5. 51.
There are no New *Hereſies*, no more than new Articles of Faith. *c.* 4. 18,37,38.
Separation from the Church of *Rome* no mark of *Hereſie* by the Fathers, whoſe Citations are anſwered. *c.*6.22,23,24,25,26,27,2 ,30,31,33,34.
No mark of *Hereſie* to want ſucceſſion of Biſhops, holding the ſame Doctrin. *c.*6.18,41.
We are not *Hereticks* for oppoſing things propounded by the Church of *Rome* for divine Truth. *c.* 6. 11, 12.
Whether Proteſtants Schiſmatically cut off the *Roman* Church from hopes of ſalvation. c. 5. 38.

I.

The *Jewiſh Church* had no *Infallibility* annexed to it, and if it had, there is no neceſſity that the Chriſtian Church ſhould have it. *c.* 2. 141.
The *Impoſing* a neceſſity of profeſſing known errors, and practiſing known corruptions, is a juſt cauſe of ſeparating from a Church. *c.* 5. 31,36,40,50,59,60,68,69.
Indifferency to all Religions falſely charged upon Proteſtants. *Anſ. Pref.* 3. & *c.*3. 12.
The belief of the Churches *Infallibility* makes way for Hereſie. *Prf.*10.
An *Infallible Guide* not needful for avoiding Hereſies. *c.* 2. 127.
The Churches *Infallibility* has not the ſame Evidence, as there is for the Scriptures. *c.* 3. 30, 31.
The Churches *Infallibility* can no way be better aſſured to us, than the Scriptures incorruption. *c.* 2.25. & *c.* 3. 27.
The Churches *Infallibility* is not proved from the promiſe that *the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt it.* c. 3. 70.
Nor from the promiſe of the *Spirits leading into all Truth*, which was made onely to the Apoſtles. *c.* 3. 71, 72.
The Churches infallibility not proved from *Epheſ.*4.11,12,13. *He gave ſome Apoſtles* &c. *till we all come in the Unity of the Faith*, &c. *c.*3. 79, 80.
That God has appointed an *Infallible Judge* of Controverſies, becauſe ſuch a one is deſirable and uſeful, is a weak concluſion. *c.*2. from 128. to 136. incluſive.
Infallibility in fundamentals, no warrant to adhere to a Church in all that ſhe propoſes. *c.* 3. 57.

In-

Infallible interpretations of Scripture vainly boasted of by the *Roman* Church. *c.* 2. 93,94,95.

Whether the denial of the Churches *Infallibility* leaves men to their private spirit, reason and discourse, and what is the harm of it. *Pref.* 12. 13. & *c.* 2. 110.

Traditional *Interpretations* of Scripture how ill preserved. *c.* 2. 10.

Interpretations of Scripture which private men make for themselves (not pretending to prescribe their sense to others) though false or seditious, endanger only themselves. *c.* 2. 122.

Allow the Pope or *Roman* Church to be a decisive *Interpreter* of Christs Laws, and she can evacuate them, and make what Laws she pleases. *Pref.* 10.11. & *c.* 2. 1.

S. *Irenæus*'s account of Tradition favours not Popery. *c.* 2. 144,145,146.

His saying that no Reformation can countervail the danger of a Schism, explained. *c.* 5. 11.

A living *Judge* to end Controversies about the sense of Scripture, not necessary. *c.* 2. 12,13.

If Christ had intended such a *Judge* in Religion, he would have named him, which he has not done. *c.* 2. 23. *c.* 3. 69. *c.* 6. 20.

Though a living *Judge* be necessary to determin Civil causes, yet not necessary for Religious causes. *c.* 2. from 14. to 22. inclus.

If there be a *Judge* of Controversies, no necessity it should be the *Roman* Church. *c.* 3. 69.

Roman Catholicks set up as many Judges in Religion as Protestants. *c.* 2. 116, 118, 153.

A *Judgment of discretion* must be allowed to every man for himself, about Religion. *c.* 2. 11.

The Protestant Doctrin of *Justification*, taken altogether, not a licentious doctrin. *c.* 7. 30.

When they say they are *justified by faith alone*, yet they make good works necessary to salvation. *c.* 7. 30.

K.

Our obligation to *know* any divine truth, arises from Gods manifest revealing it. *c.* 3. 19.

L.

How we are assured in what *Language* the Scripture is uncorrupted. *c.* 2. 55, 56, 57.

To *leave* a Church, and to leave the external Communion of a Church, is not the same thing. *c.* 5. 32, 45, 47.

Luthers separation not like that of the *Donatists*, and why. *c.* 5. 33. 101.

Luther and his followers did not divide from the whole Church, being a part of it, but onely reformed themselves, forsaking the corrupt part. *c.* 5. 56.

Luthers opposing himself to all in his reformation, no objection against him. *c.* 5. 89, 90.

We are not bound to justifie all that *Luther* said and did, no more than Papists are bound to justifie what several Popes have said and done. *c.* 5. 112.

M.

They may be *members* of the Catholick Church, that are not united in external Communion. *c.* 5. 9.
The Proteſtant Doctrin of *Merit* explained. *c.* 4.35,36.
The Authors *Motives* to change his Religions, with Anſwers to them. *Pref.* 42. 43.
The Faith of Papiſts reſolved at laſt into the *Motives* of Credibility. *c.* 2. 154.
The *Miſchiefs* that followed the Reformation, not imputable to it. *c.* 5. 92.

N.

What make points *neceſſary* to be believed. *c.* 4. 4, 11. No more is *neceſſary* to be believed by us, than by the Apoſtles. *c.* 4.67,70,71,72.
Papiſts make many things *neceſſary* to ſalvation, which God never made ſo. *c.* 7. 7.
All *neceſſary* points of Faith are contained in the Creed. *c.* 4.73,74.
Why ſome points not ſo *neceſſary* were put into the Creed. *c.* 4. 75,76.
Proteſtants may agree in *neceſſary* points, though they may overvalue ſome things they hold. *c.* 7. 34.
To impoſe a *neceſſity* of profeſſing known errors, and practiſing known corruptions, is a juſt cauſe of ſeparation. *c.* 5.31,36,40,50,59,60,68, 69.

O.

A blind *obedience* is not due to Eccleſiaſtical deciſions, though our practiſe muſt be determined by the ſentence of ſuperiours in doubtful caſes. *c.* 5. 110.
A probable *opinion* may be followed (according to the *Roman* Doctors) though it be not the ſafeſt way for avoiding ſin. *c.* 7, 8.
Optatus's ſaying impertinently urged againſt Proteſtants. *c.* 5.99,100.
Though we receive *Ordination* and Scripture from a falſe Church, yet we may be a true Church. *c.* 6. 54.

P.

Whether *Papiſts* or *Proteſtants* moſt hazard their ſouls on probabilities. *c.* 4. 57.
What we believe concerning the *Perpetuity* of the Viſible Church. *Anſ. Pref.* 18.
Whether 1 *Tim.* 3. 15. *The Pillar and ground of Truth*, belong to *Timothy* or to the Church. *c.* 3.76.
If thoſe words belong to the Church, whether they may not ſignifie her duty, and yet that ſhe may err in neglecting it. *c.* 3. 77.
A *poſſibility* of being deceived, argues not an uncertainty in all we believe. *c.* 3. 26,50, *c.* 5. 107. *c.* 6. 47.
By joyning in the *Prayers* of the *Roman* Church, we muſt joyn in her unlawful practices. *c.* 3. 11.
Preaching of the Word and adminiſtring the Sacrament, how they are inſeparable notes of the Church, and how they make it viſible. *c.* 5.19.

Private Spirit, how we are to underſtand it. *c.* 2. 110.
Private Spirit is not appealed to (*i. e.* to dictates pretending to come from Gods ſpirit) when Controverſies are referred to Scripture. *c.* 2. 110.
Whether one is left to his *private* ſpirit, reaſon and diſcourſe, by denying the Churches infallibility, and the harm of it. *Pref.* 12, 13. & *c.* 2. 110.
A mans *private judgment* may be oppoſed to the publick, when Reaſon and Scripture warrant him. *c.* 5. 109.
A *probable opinion*, according to the *Roman* Doctors, may be followed, though it is not the ſafeſt way for avoiding ſin. *c.* 7. 8.
It's hard for Papiſts to reſolve, what is a *ſufficient propoſal* of the Church. *c.* 3. 54.
Proteſtants are on the ſurer ſide for avoiding ſin, and *Papiſts* on the more dangerous ſide to commit ſin, ſhewed in inſtances. *c.* 7. 9.

R.

Every man by *Reaſon* muſt judge both of Scripture and the Church. *c.* 2. 111, 112, 113, 118, 120, 122.
Reaſon and judgment of diſcretion, is not to be reproached for the private ſpirit. *c.* 2. 110.
If men muſt not follow their *Reaſon*, what they are to follow. *c.* 2. 114, 115.
Some kind of *Reformation* may be ſo neceſſary, as to juſtifie ſeparation from a corrupt Church, though every pretence of reformation will not. *c.* 5. 53.
Nothing is more againſt *Religion*, than uſing violence to introduce it. *c.* 5. 96.
The *Religion* of Proteſtants (which is the belief of the Bible) a wiſer and ſafer way than that of the *Roman* Church, ſhewed at large. *c.* 6. from 56. to 72. Incluſ.
All Proteſtants require *Repentance* to remiſſion of ſins, and remiſſion of ſins to Juſtification. *c.* 7. 31.
No *Revelations* known to be ſo, may be rejected as not Fundamental. *c.* 4. 11.
A Divine *revelation* may be ignorantly disbelieved by a Church, and yet it may continue a Church. *c.* 3. 20.
Things equally *revealed*, may not be ſo to ſeveral perſons. *c.* 3. 24.
Papiſts cannot have *Reverence* for the Scripture, whilſt they advance ſo many things contrary to it. *c.* 2. 1.
No argument of their *reverence* to it, that they have preſerved it intire. *c.* 2. 2.
The *Roman Church*, when *Luther* ſeparated, was not *the viſible Church*, though *a viſible* Church, and part of the Catholick. *c.* 5. 26, 27.
The preſent *Roman Church* has loſt all Authority to recommend what we are to believe in Religion. *c.* 2. 101.
The properties of a *perfect Rule*. *c.* 2. 5. 6, 7.
Whether the Popiſh *Rule* of Fundamentals, or ours is the ſafeſt. *c.* 4. 63.

S.

Right adminiſtration of *Sacraments* uncertain in the *Roman* Church. *c.* 2. from 63. to 68. incluſive.

In

In what ſenſe *Salvation* may be had in the *Roman* Church. *Anſ. Pref.* 5,7.
Salvation depends upon great uncertainties in the *Roman* Church. *c.* 2. from 63. to 73. incluſ.
Schiſms whence they chiefly ariſe, and what continues them. *c.* 4. 17.
Schiſm may be a Diviſion of the Church, as well as from it. *c.* 5. 22.
He may be no *Schiſmatick*, that forſakes a Church for Errors not damnable. *Anſ. Pref.* 2.
No *Schiſm* to leave a corrupted Church, when otherwiſe we muſt communicate in her corruptions. *c.* 5. 25.
Not every ſeparation from the external Communion of the Church, but a cauſeleſs one, is the ſin of *Schiſm*. *c.* 5. 30.
They may not be *Schiſmaticks* that continue the ſeparation from *Rome*, though *Luther* that began it, had been a *Schiſmatick*. *c.* 5. 4. & *c.* 6. 14.
The *Scripture* cannot be duly reverenced by Papiſts. *c.* 2. *n.* 1.
The *Scripture* how proved to be the word of God. *c.* 4. 53.
The Divine Authority of the *Scripture* may be certain, though it be not ſelf-evidently certain, that it is Gods word. *c.* 6. 51.
Books of *Scripture* now held for Canonical, which the *Roman* Church formerly rejected. *c.* 2. 90, 91.
Whether ſome Books of *Scripture* defined for Canonical, were not afterward rejected. *c.* 3. 29.
The *Scripture* in things neceſſary is intelligible to learned and unlearned. *c.* 2. 104, 105, 106.
Some Books of *Scripture* queſtioned by the Fathers as well as by Proteſtants. *c.* 2. 34.
The *Scripture* has great Authority from internal Arguments. *c.* 2. 47.
The Truth of *Scripture* inſpiration depends not on the authority of the *Roman* Church. *Pref.* 14. & *c.* 6. 45.
If the *Scriptures* contain all neceſſary truths, Popery is confuted. *Pref.* 30. to 38. incluſive.
The true meaning of *Scripture* not uncertain in neceſſary points. *c.* 2. 84.
A determinate ſenſe of obſcure places of *Scripture*, is not needful. *c.* 2. 127, 150.
The ſenſe of plain places of Scripture, may be known by the ſame means, by which the Papiſts know the ſence of thoſe places that prove the Church. *c.* 2. 150, 151.
God may give means to the Church to know the true ſenſe of *Scripture*, yet it is not neceſſary it ſhould have that ſenſe. *c.* 2. 93.
It is eaſier to know the *Scripture* and its ſenſe, than for the ignorant in the *Roman* Church which is the Church, and what are her decrees, and the ſenſe of them. *c.* 2. 107, 108, 109.
In what Language the *Scripture* is incorrupted, and the aſſurance of it. *c.* 2. 55, 56, 57.
The *Scripture* is capable of the properties of a perfect Rule. *c.* 2. 7.
In what ſenſe we ſay the *Scripture* is a perfect Rule of Faith. *c.* 2. 8.
The *Scripture* not properly a judge of Controverſies, but a Rule to judge by. *c.* 2. 11, 104, 155.

The *Scriptures* incorruption more ſecured by providence, than the *Roman* Churches vigilancy. *c.* 2. 24.
When *Scripture* is made the Rule of Controverſies, thoſe that concern it ſelf are to be excepted. *c.* 2. 8, 27, 156.
The *Scripture* contains all neceſſary material objects of Faith, of which the Scripture it ſelf is none, but the means of conveying them to us. *c.* 2. 32. 159.
The *Scripture* muſt determine ſome Controverſies, elſe thoſe about the Church and its Notes are undeterminable. *c.* 2. 3.
The *Scripture* unjuſtly charged with increaſing Controverſies and Contentions. *c.* 2. 4.
The *Scripture* is a ſufficient means for diſcovering Hereſies. *c.* 2. 127.
When Controverſies are referred to Scripture, it is not referring them to the private ſpirit, underſtanding it of a perſwaſion pretending to come from the Spirit of God. *c.* 2. 110.
Proteſtants that believe *Scripture*, agree in more things than they differ in, and their differences are not material. *c.* 4. 49, 50.
Private men, if they interpret *Scriptures* amiſs and to ill purpoſes, endanger only themſelves, when they do not pretend to preſcribe to others. *c.* 2. 122.
The Proteſtants *Security* of the way to happineſs. *c.* 2. 53.
Want of Skill in *School-Divinity* fooliſhly objected againſt *Engliſh* Divines. *Pref.* 19.
The Principles of the Church of *Englands ſeparating* from *Rome*, will not ſerve to juſtifie Schiſmaticks. *c.* 5. 71, 74, 80, 81, 82, 85, 86.
Socinianiſm and other Hereſies countenanced by *Romiſh* Writers, who have undermined the Doctrin of the Trinity. *Pref.* 17. 18.
The promiſe of the *Spirits leading into all truth*, proves not Infallibility. *c.* 3. 71.
The promiſe of the *Spirits abiding with them for ever*, may be perſonal. *c.* 3. 74.
And it being a conditional promiſe, cuts off the *Roman* Churches pretence to infallibility. *c.* 3. 75.
Want of *Succeſſion* of Biſhops, holding always the ſame Doctrin, is not a mark of Hereſie. *c.* 6. 38, 41.
In what ſenſe *Succeſſion* is by the Fathers made a mark of the true Church. *c.* 6. 40.
Papiſts cannot prove a perpetual *Succeſſion* of Profeſſors of their Doctrin. *c.* 6. 41.

T.

Tradition proves the Books of Scripture to be Canonical, not the Authority of the preſent Church. *c.* 2. 25, 53, 90, 91, 92. & *c.* 3. 27.
Traditional Interpretations of Scripture how ill preſerved by the *Roman* Church. *c.* 2. 10. & *c.* 3. 46.
No *Traditional Interpretations* of Scripture, though if there were any remaining we are ready to receive them. *c.* 2. 88, 89. & *c.* 3. 46.

The

The *Traditions* distinct from Scripture which *Irœneus* mentions, do not favour Popery. *c.* 2. 144, 145, 146.
The asserting unwritten *Traditions*, though not inconsistent with the truth of Scripture, yet disparages it as a perfect Rule. *c.* 2. 10.
Though our *Translations* of the Bible are subject to error, yet our salvation is not thereby made uncertain. *c.* 2. 68, 73.
Different *Translations* of Scripture may as well be objected to the Ancient Church, as to Protestants. *c.* 2. 58, 59.
The Vulgar *Translation* is not pure and uncorrupted. *c.* 2. 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80.
To believe *Transubstantiation*, how many contradictions one must believe. *c.* 4. 46.
The Doctrin of the Trinity undermined by *Roman* Doctors. *Pref.* 17, 18.
The Church may *tolerate* many things, which she does not allow. *c.* 3. 47.
Gods *Truth* not questioned by Protestants, though they deny points professed by the Church. *c.* 1. 12.
Protestants question not Gods *Truth*, though denying some truth revealed by him, if they know it not to be so revealed. *c.* 3. 16.
The *Truth* of the present Church, depends not upon the visibility or perpetuity of the Church in all Ages. *c.* 5. 21. & *c.* 7. 20.
The Apostles depositing *Truth* with the Church, is no argument that she should always keep it intire and sincere. *c.* 2. 148.
The promise of being *led into all truth*, agrees not equally to the Apostles and to the Church. *c.* 3. 34.
A *Tryal* of Religion by Scripture, may well be refused by Papists. *c.* 2, 3.

U.

Violence and force to introduce Religion, is against the nature of Religion, and unjustly charged upon Protestants. *c.* 5. 96.
What *Visible Church* was before *Luther*, disagreeing from the *Roman*. *Anſ. Pref.* 19. & *c.* 5. 27.
That there should be always a *visible* unerring Church, of one denomination, is not necessary. *c.* 5. 27.
The *Visible Church* may not cease, though it may cease to be visible. *c.* 5. 13, 14, 41.
The Church may not be *Visible* in the Popish sense, and yet may not dissemble but profess her faith. *c.* 5. 18.
The great *uncertainties* salvation in the *Roman* Church depends on. *c.* 2. 63. to 73. inclusive.
Their *uncertainty* of the right administration of Sacraments. *c.* 2. 63. to 68. inclusive.
The Churches *Unity*, by what means best preserved. *c.* 3. 81. *c.* 4. 13, 17, 40.
Pretence of Infallibility a ridiculous means to *Unity*, when that is the chief question to be determined. *c.* 3. 89.
Unity of Communion how to be obtained. *c.* 4. 39, 40.

Unity of external Communion not neceſſary to the being a Member of the Catholick Church. *c.* 5. 9.

Univerſality of a Doctrin, no certain ſign that it came from the Apoſtles. *c.* 3. 44.

Want of *Univerſality* of place, proves not Proteſtants to be Hereticks, and may as well be objected againſt the *Roman* Church. *c.* 6. 42, 55.

We would receive *unwritten Traditions* derived from the Apoſtles, if we knew what they were. *c.* 3. 46.

The *Vulgar Tranſlation* not pure and incorrupted. *c.* 2. 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80.

W.

The *whole Doctrin* of Chriſt was taught by the Apoſtles, and an Anathema denounced againſt any that ſhould bring in new doctrins. *c.* 4. 18.

The *wiſdom* of Proteſtants juſtified, in forſaking the errors of the *Roman* Church. *c.* 6. 53, 54.

The wiſdom of Proteſtants ſhewed at large againſt the Papiſts, in making the Bible their Religion. *c.* 6. from 56. to 72. incluſive.

FINIS.

ADDITIONAL DISCOURSES OF Mr. Chillingworth NEVER BEFORE PRINTED.

Imprimatur.

Ex Ædib. Lambeth.
Jun. 14. 1686.

GUIL. NEEDHAM RR.
in Christo P. ac D. D. Wilhelmo
Archiep. Cant. à Sacr. Domesticis.

LONDON,

Printed for *Richard Chiswell* at the *Rose* and *Crown* in S. *Pauls* Church-Yard, 1687.

CONTENTS.

I. A *Conference betwixt Mr.* Chillingworth *and Mr.* Lewgar, *whether the* Roman Church *be the* Catholick-Church, *and all out of her Communion Hereticks or Schismaticks.* p. 1.

II. *A Discourse against the Infallibility of the* Roman Church, *with an Answer to all those Texts of Scripture that are alledged to prove it.* p. 26.

III. *A Conference concerning the Infallibility of the* Roman Church; *proving that the present Church of* Rome *either errs in her worshiping the Blessed Virgin; or that the Ancient Church did err in condemning the* Collyridians *as Hereticks.* p. 41.

IV. *An Argument drawn from Communicating of Infants, as without which they could not be saved against the Churches Infallibility.* p. 68.

V. *An Argument against Infallibility, drawn from the Doctrin of the* Millenaries. p. 80.

VI. *A Letter relating to the same subject.* p. 89.

VII.

VII. *An Argument againſt the* Roman *Churches Infallibility, taken from the Contradictions in their Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation.* p. 91.

VIII. *An account of what moved the Author to turn a Papiſt, with his Confutation of the Arguments that perſwaded him thereto.* p. 94.

IX. *A Diſcourſe concerning Tradition.* p. 103.

The Reader is deſired to take notice of a great miſtake of the Printer and to Correct it, That he has made this the running Title over moſt of the Additional Pieces, *viz. A Conference betwixt* Mr. *Chillingworth and* Mr. *Lewgar*; which ſhould only have been ſet over the firſt: there are alſo ſome literal miſtakes, as pag. 65. ἐσχεγῶν twice for ἐσχεγῶνι and ſuch like, not to be imputed to the Author.

A CON-

A CONFERENCE BETWIXT Mr. *CHILLINGWORTH* AND Mr. *LEWGAR*.

Theſis. THE Church of *Rome* (taken diffuſively for all Chriſtians communicating with the Biſhop of *Rome*) was the Judge of Controverſies at that time, when the Church of *England* made an alteration in her Tenents.

Argu. She was the Judge of Controverſies at that time, which had an Authority of deciding them. But the Church of *Rome* at that time had the Authority of deciding them. *Ergo.*

Anſw. A limited Authority to decide Controverſies according to the Rule of Scripture and Univerſal Tradition, and to oblige her own Members (ſo long as ſhe evidently contradicted not that Rule) to obedience I grant ſhe had: but an unlimited, an infallible Authority, or ſuch as could not but proceed according to that Rule, and ſuch as ſhould bind all the Churches in the World to Obedience (as the *Greek* Church) I ſay ſhe had not.

Queſt. When your Church hath decided a Controverſie, I deſire to know whether any particular Church or perſon hath Authority to reexamine her deciſion, whether

ſhe hath obſerved her Rule or no ; and free himſelf from the obedience of it, by his or her particular judgment?

Anſw. If you underſtand by your Church, the Church Catholick, probably I ſhould anſwer no : but if you underſtand by your Church, that only which is in Subordination to the See of *Rome*, or if you underſtand a Council of this Church, I anſwer, yea.

Arg. That was the Catholick Church, which did abide in the Root of Apoſtolick Unity : But the Church of *Rome* at that time was the only Church that did abide in the Root of Apoſtolick Unity. *Ergo.*

Queſt. What mean you by Apoſtolick Unity ?

Anſw. I mean the Unity of that Fellowſhip wherein the Apoſtles Lived and Died.

Queſt. Wherein was this Unity ?

Anſw. Herein it conſiſted, that they all profeſſed one Faith, obeyed one Supream Tribunal, and communicated together in the ſame Prayers and Sacraments.

Solut. Then the Church of *Rome* continued not in this Apoſtolick Unity; for it continued not in the ſame Faith, wherein the Apoſtles Lived and Died : for though it retained ſo much (in my judgment) as was eſſential to the being of a Church, yet it degenerated from the Church of the Apoſtles times, in many things which were very profitable; as in Latin Service, and Communion in one kind.

Argu. Some Church did continue in the ſame Faith wherein the Apoſtles lived and died : But there was no Church at that time which did continue in the Apoſtles Faith beſides the *Roman* Church. *Ergo.*

Anſw. That ſome Church did continue in the Apoſtles Faith in all things neceſſary, I grant it : that any did continue in the Integrity of it, and in a perfect conformity with it in all things expedient and profitable, I deny it.

Queſt. Is it not neceſſary to a Churches continuing in the Apoſtles Faith, that ſhe continue in a perfect conformity with it in all things expedient and profitable ?

Anſw. A perfect conformity in all things is neceſſary to a perfect continuance in the Apoſtles Faith : but to

an

an imperfect continuance, an imperfect conformity is sufficient; and such I grant the *Roman* Church had.

Quest. Is not a perfect continuance in the Apostles Faith necessary to a Churches continuance in Apostolick Unity?

Answ. It is necessary to a perfect continuance in Apostolick Unity.

Argu. There was some one company of Christians at the time of *Luthers* rising, which was the *Catholick Church*; But there was no other company at that time besides the *Roman*: *Ergo*, the *Roman* at that time was the *Catholick Church*.

Answ. There was no one company of Christians, which in opposition to and Exclusion of all other companies of Christians was the Catholick Church.

Argu. If the *Catholick Church* be some one company of Christians in opposition to and exclusion of all other companies, then if there was some one company, she was one in opposition to and exclusion of all other companies: But the *Catholick Church* is one company of Christians in opposition to and exclusion of, *&c. Ergo*, There was then some one company which was the *Catholick Church* in opposition to and exclusion of all other companies.

The *Minor* proved by the Testimonies of the Fathers, both Greek and Latin, testifying that they understood the Church to be *one* in the sense alledged.

1. If this Unity which cannot be separated at all or divided, is also among Hereticks, what contend we farther? Why call we them Hereticks, S. *Cypr. Epist.* 75.

2. But if there be but one Flock, how can he be accounted of the Flock, which is not within the number of it? *Id*: *Ibid.*

3. When *Parmenian* commends one Church, he condemns all the rest; for besides one, which is the true *Catholick*, other Churches are esteemed to be among Hereticks, but are not. S. *Optat. lib.* 1.

4. The Church therefore is but one, this cannot be among all Hereticks and Schismaticks. *Ibid.*

5. You ſay you offer for the Church, which is one; this very thing is part of a lie to call it one, which you have divided into two: *Id: Ibid.*

6. The Church is *one*, which cannot be amongſt us and amongſt you; it remains then, that it be in one only place. *Id: Ibid.*

7. Although there be many Hereſies of Chriſtians, and that all would be called *Catholicks*, yet there is always one Church, *&c.* S. *Auguſt. de util. credend. c.* 7.

8. The queſtion between us is, where the Church is, whether with us or with them, for ſhe is but *one. Id: de unitat. c.* 2.

9. The proofs of the *Catholick* prevailed, whereby they evicted the Body of Chriſt to be with them, and by conſequence not to be with the *Donatiſts*; for it is manifeſt that ſhe is *one* alone. *Id. Collat. Carthag. lib.* 3.

10. In illud cantic. 6. 7.. *There are* 60 *Queens and* 80 *Concubines and Damoſels without number, but my Dove is one,* &c. He ſaid not, *my* Queens are 60, and *my Concubines*, &c. but he ſaid my Dove is but one; becauſe all the Sects of Philoſophers and Hereſies of Chriſtians are none of his; his is but one, to wit, the *Catholick* Church, *&c.* S. *Epiphan. in fine Panar.*

11. A man may not call the Conventicles of Hereticks (I mean *Marcionites, Manichees*, and the reſt) Churches; therefore the Tradition appoints you to ſay, *I believe one Holy Catholick Church*, &c. S. *Cyrill. Catech.* 18.

And theſe Teſtimonies I think are ſufficient to ſhew the judgment of the Ancient Church, that this Title of the Church *one*, is directly and properly excluſive to all companies beſides one; to wit, that where there are diverſe profeſſions of Faith, or diverſe Communions, there is but one of theſe, which can be the *Catholick Church*. Upon this ground I deſire ſome company of Chriſtians to be named, profeſſing a diverſe Faith, and holding a diverſe Communion from the *Roman*, which was the *Catholick Church* at the time of *Luthers* riſing: and if no other in this ſenſe can be named, than was ſhe the *Catholick Church* at that time, and therefore her judgment to be reſted in, and

and her Communion to be embraced upon peril of Schism and Heresie.

Mr. *Chillingworths* Answer.

Upon the same ground, if you pleased, you might desire a Protestant to name some Company of Christians, professing a diverse Faith, and holding a diverse Communion from the *Greek* Church, which was the Catholick Church at the time of *Luthers* rising; and seeing he could name no other in this sense. concludes that the *Greek* Church was the Catholick Church at that time. Upon the very same ground you might have concluded for the Church of the *Abyssines*, or *Armenians*, or any other society of Christians extant before *Luthers* time. And seeing this is so, thus I argue against your ground.

1. That ground which concludes indifferently for both parts of a contradiction, must needs be false and deceitful, and conclude for neither part: But this ground concludes indifferently both parts of a contradiction; *viz.* That the *Greek* Church is the Catholick Church, and not the *Roman*, as well as, That the *Roman* is the Catholick Church, and not the *Greek*: Therefore the ground is false and deceitful, seem it never so plausible.

2. I answer Secondly, that you should have taken notice of my Answer, which I then gave you; which was, that your *major*, as you then framed your Argument, but as now, your *minor* is not always true, if by *one* you understand *one* in external Communion; seeing nothing hindred in my Judgment, but that one Church excommunicated by another upon an insufficient cause, might yet remain a true member of the Catholick Church; and that Church, which upon the overvaluing this cause doth excommunicate the other, though in fault, may yet remain a member of the Catholick Church: which is evident from the difference about *Easter-day* between the Church of *Rome* and the Churches of *Asia*; for which vain matter *Victor* Bishop of *Rome* excommunicated the Churches of *Asia*. And yet I believe you will not say, that either the Church excommunicating, or the Church excommunicated, ceased

ſed to be a true member of the Church Catholick. The caſe is the ſame between the *Greek* and the *Roman* Church; for though the difference between them be greater, yet it is not ſo great, as to be a ſufficient ground of excommunication: and therefore the excommunication was cauſeleſs, and conſequently *Brutum fulmen*, and not ratified or confirmed by God in Heaven; and therefore the Church of *Greece* at *Luthers* riſing might be, and was a true member of the Catholick Church.

As concerning the places of Fathers, which you alledge; I demand, 1. If I can produce you an equal, or greater number of Fathers, or more ancient than theſe, not contradicted by any that lived with them or before them, for ſome doctrin condemned by the *Roman* Church, whether you will ſubſcribe it? If not, with what face or conſcience can you make uſe of, aud build your whole Faith upon the Authority of Fathers in ſome things, and reject the ſame authority in others?

2. Secondly, becauſe you urge S. *Cyprians* Authority, I deſire you to tell me, whether this Argument in his time would have concluded a neceſſity of reſting in the Judgement of the *Roman* Church, or no? If not, how ſhould it come to paſs, that it ſhould ſerve now, and not then, fit this time and not that? as if it were like an Almanack, that would not ſerve for all Meridians? If it would, why was it not urged by others upon S. *Cyprian*, or repreſented by S. *Cyprian* to himſelf for his direction, when he differed from the *Roman* Church, and all other that herein conformed unto her, touching the point of Re-baptizing Hereticks; which the *Roman* Church held unlawful and damnable, S. *Cyprian* not only lawful, but neceſſary; ſo well did he reſt in the Judgment of that Church: *Quid verba audiam, cùm facta videam*, ſays he in the Comedy? And Cardinal *Perron* tells you in his Epiſtle to *Caſaubon*, that nothing is more unreaſonable, than to draw conſequences from the words of Fathers, againſt their lively and actual practice.

The ſame may be ſaid in refutation of the places out of S. *Auſtin*; who was ſo far from concluding, from them or any

any other, a neceſſity of reſting in the Judgment of the *Roman* Church, that he himſelf, as your Authors teſtifie, lived and died in oppoſition of it; even in that main fundamental point, upon which Mr. *Lewgar* hath built the neceſſity of his departure from the Church of *England*, and embracing the Communion of the *Roman* Church, that is, The Supream Authority of that Church over other Churches, and the power of receiving Appeals from them. Mr. *Lewgar*, I know, cannot be ignorant of theſe things; and therefore I wonder, with what conſcience he can produce their words againſt us, whoſe Actions are for us.

If it be ſaid, that S. *Cyprian* and S. *Auſtin* were Schiſmaticks for doing ſo; it ſeems then Schiſmaticks may not only be members of the Church, againſt Mr. *Lewgars* main concluſion, but Canoniz'd Saints of it; or elſe S. *Auſtin* and S. *Cyprian* ſhould be raſed out of the *Roman* Kalendar.

If it be ſaid, that the point of Re-baptization was not defined in S. *Cyprians* time; I ſay that in the Judgment of the Biſhop and Church of *Rome* and their adherents, it was: For they urged it as an Original and Apoſtolick Tradition, and conſequently at leaſt of as great force as any Church definition. They excommunicated *Firmilianus* and condemned S. *Cyprian*, as a falſe Chriſt, and a falſe Apoſtle, for holding the contrary; and urged him *Tyrannico terrore* to conform his judgment to theirs, as he himſelf clearly intimates.

If it be ſaid, they differed only from the particular Church of *Rome*, and not from the *Roman* Church, taking it for the univerſal ſociety of Chriſtians in Communion with that Church: I Anſwer,

1. They know no ſuch ſenſe of the word, I am ſure never uſed it in any ſuch; which whether it had been poſſible, if the Church of *Rome* had been in their judgment to other Churches in ſpiritual matters, as the City was to other Cities and Countries in temporals, I leave it to indifferent men to judge.

2. Secondly,

2. Secondly, that they differed not only from the particular *Roman* Church, but also from all other Churches, that agreed with it in those doctrins.

3. Thirdly, I desire you would answer me directly, whether the *Roman* Church, taking it for that particular Church, be of necessity to be held Infallible in Faith by every *Roman* Catholick, or not. To this Question I instantly desire a direct answer without tergiversation, that we may at length get out of the cloud, and you may say, *Coram, quem quæritis, adsum.* If you say, they are not bound to believe so; then it is no Article of Faith, nor no certain truth upon which men may safely rest without fluctuation or fear of error: And if so; I demand

1. Why are all your Clergy bound to swear, and consequently your Laity (if they have Communion of Faith with them) by your own grounds, bound to believe, That the *Roman* Church is the Mistris of all other Churches? where it is evident from the relation and opposition of the *Roman* to other Churches, that the *Roman* Church is there taken for that particular Church.

2. Secondly, why then do you so often urge that mistaken saying of *Iræneus, Ad hanc Ecclesiam necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam?* falsely translating it, as Cardinal *Perron* in *French,* and my *L. F.* in *English*——*All Churches must agree with this Church*; for *convenire ad* signifies not to *agree with,* but to *come unto*; whereas it is evident for the aforesaid reason, that the *Roman* is here taken for that particular Church.

3. Thirdly, if that particular Church be not certainly infallible, but subject to error in points of faith; I would know, if any division of your Church should happen, in which the Church of *Rome* either alone, or with some others should take one way; the Churches of *Spain* and *France,* and many other Churches another, what direction should an ignorant Catholick have then from the pretended Guide of Faith? How shall he know which of these Companies is the Church? seeing all other Churches distinguished from the *Roman* may err, and seeing the *Roman* Church is now supposed subject to error, and consequently

ly not certain to guard thoſe men, or thoſe Churches that adhere unto it from erring.

4. Fourthly, if that particular Church be not infallible in Faith, let us then ſuppoſe that *de facto* it does err in faith; ſhall we not then have an Heretical head upon a Catholick body? A head of the Church, which were no member of the Church? which ſure were a very ſtrange and heterogeneous Monſter! If to avoid theſe inconveniences you will ſay, that *Roman* Catholicks muſt of neceſſity hold that particular Church infallible in faith; I ſuppoſe it will evidently follow, that S. *Auſtin* and S. *Cyprian* (notwithſtanding thoſe ſentences you pretend out of them) were no *Roman* Catholicks; ſeeing they lived and died in the contrary belief and profeſſion. Let me ſee theſe abſurdities fairly and clearly avoided, and I will diſpute no more, but follow you whitherſoever you ſhall lead me.

3. Thirdly, I anſwer, that the places alledged are utterly impertinent to the concluſion you ſhould have proved; which was, That it was impoſſible, that two Societies of Chriſtians divided upon what cauſe ſoever in external Communion, may be in truth and in Gods account, both of them parts of the Catholick Church: whereas your teſtimonies, if we grant them all, ſay no more but this; That the Societies of Hereticks, which are ſuch as overthrow any doctrin neceſſary to ſalvation; and of Schiſmaticks, which are ſuch as ſeparate from the Churches Communion without any pretence of error in the Church or unlawfulneſs in the conditions of her Communion; I ſay, they prove only this, that ſuch Societies as theſe, are no parts of the Church: which I willingly grant of all ſuch, as are properly and formally Hereticks and Schiſmaticks; from which number I think (with S. *Auſtin*) they are to be exempted, *Qui quærunt cautâ ſollicitudine veritatem, corrigi parati, cùm invenerint.* Whereas I put the caſe of ſuch two Societies, which not differing indeed in any thing neceſſary to ſalvation, do yet erroneouſly believe that the errors wherewith they charge one another, are damnable, and ſo by this opinion of mutual error, are kept on both ſides from being Hereticks.

Becauſe I deſire to bring you and others to the truth, or to be brought to it by you, I thought good for your direction in your intended Reply, to acquaint you with theſe things:

1. That I conceive the————in your diſcourſe is this. That whenſoever any two Societies of Chriſtians differ in external Communion, one of them muſt be of neceſſity Heretical or Schiſmatical. I conceive there is no ſuch neceſſity; and that the ſtories of *Victor* and the Biſhops of *Aſia*, S. *Cyprian* and Pope *Stephen* make it evident; and therefore I deſire you to produce ſome convincing argument to the contrary; and that you may the better do it, I thought good to inform you what I mean by an *Heretick*, and what by a *Schiſmatick*.

An *Heretick* therefore I conceive him, that holds an Error againſt Faith with obſtinacy. Obſtinate I conceive him, who will not change his Opinion, when his reaſons for it are ſo anſwered, that he cannot reply; and when the reaſons againſt it are ſo convincing, that he cannot anſwer them. By the Faith I underſtand all thoſe Doctrines and no more, which Chriſt taught his Apoſtles, and the Apoſtles the Church; yet I exclude not from this number the certain and evident deductions of them.

A *Schiſmatick* I account him, (and *Facundus Hermianenſis* hath taught me to do ſo) who, without any ſuppoſing of error in the conditions of a Churches Communion, divides himſelf either from the obedience of that Church to which he owes obedience; or from the Communion of that Church to which he owes Communion.

2. Another thing, which I thought fit to acquaint you with, is this: That you go upon another very falſe and deceitful ſuppoſition; *viz.* that if we will not be *Proteſtants*, preſently we muſt be *Papiſts*; if we forſake the Church of *England*, we muſt go preſently to the Church of *Rome*: Whereas if your Arguments did conclude (as they do not) that before *Luthers* time, there was ſome Church of one Denomination, which was the Catholick Church; I ſhould much rather think it were the Church of *Greece*, than the Church of *Rome*; and I believe others alſo would think

think so as well as I, but for that reason which one gives, why more men hold the Pope above a Council, than a Council above a Pope, that is, because Councils give no maintenance or preferment, and the Popes do.

Think not yet, I pray, that I say this, as if I conceived this to be your reason for preferring the *Roman* Church before the *Greek*; (for I protest I do not) but rather, that conceiving verily you were to leave the Church of *England*, to avoid trouble you took the next Boat, and went to the Church of *Rome*, because that bespake you first.

You impute to me (as I hear) that the way I take is destructive only, and that I build nothing; which first, is not a fault; for Christian Religion is not now to be built; but only I desire to have the rubbish and impertinent Lumber taken off, which you have laid upon it, which hides the glorious simplicity of it from them which otherwise would embrace it. Remember, I pray, *Averroes* his saying; *Quandoquidem Christiani adorant quod comedunt, sit anima mea cum Philosophis*; and consider the swarms of Atheists in *Italy*, and then tell me, whether your unreasonable and contradictious Doctrines, your forged Miracles and counterfeit Legends have not in all probability produced this effect. Secondly, if it be a fault, it is certainly your own; for your discourse intended for the proof of a positive conclusion —— *That we must be Papists* —— proves *in deed and in truth* nothing; but even *in shew and appearance* no more but this Negative, that we must not be Protestants; but what we must be, if we must not be Protestants, God knows; you in this Discourse (I am sure) do not shew it.

Mr. *Lewgars* Reply.

§. 1. The minor of Mr. *Chillingworths* Argument against my ground is very weak, being framed upon a false supposition, that a Protestant could name no other Church professing a diverse Faith, &c. from the *Greek* Church, which was the Catholick Church: for if he could not indeed name any other, the title would remain to the *Greek* Church: But he hath the *Roman* to name, and so my ground cannot conclude, either for the *Greek* or *Abyssine* or

any other, beſides the *Roman*, but for that it does, except he can name ſome other.

§. 2. His ſecond anſwer is weak likewiſe; for my Minor is always true; at leaſt they thought it to be ſo, whoſe Authorities I produce in confirmation of it, as will appear to any one that conſiders them well; how their force lies in *Theſi*, not in *Hypotheſi*; not that the Church was not then divided into more Societies than one, but that ſhe could never be.

§. 3. As for his Inſtance to the contrary, wherein he believes I will not ſay the Churches excommunicated by *Victor* ceaſed to be a true member of the Catholick: If I ſay ſo, I ſay no more than the Ancient Fathers ſaid before me. *Iræneus* when he deſired *Victor* μὴ κεφαλοτμῆσαι, not to cut off ſo many and great Churches; and *Ruffinus*, *reprehendit eam, quod non benè feciſſet abſcindere ab unitate corporis*, &c.

§. 4. But howſoever the caſe of Excommunication may be, the diviſion of external Communion which I intended, and the Fathers ſpake of in the alledged Authorities, was that which was made by voluntary ſeparation.

§. 5. Whereby the Church (before one Society) is divided into ſeveral diſtinct Societies, both claiming to be the Church; of which Societies ſo divided, but one can be the Catholick; and this is proved by the Authorities alledged; which Authorities muſt not be anſwered by diſproving them, as he does (for that is to change his Adverſary, and confute the Fathers ſayings, inſtead of mine) but by ſhewing their true ſenſe or judgment to be otherwiſe than I alledged it.

§. 6. To his demand upon the places alledged I Anſwer, that I do not build my whole faith of this concluſion upon the Authority of thoſe Fathers; for I produce them, not for the Authority of the thing, but of the Expoſition. The thing it ſelf is an Article of the Creed, *Unam Catholicam*; grounded in expreſs Scripture, *Columba mea unica*: but becauſe there is difference in underſtanding this Propheſie, I produce theſe Authorities, to ſhew the Judgment of the Ancient Church how they underſtood it; and the proper anſwer to this is either to ſhew, that theſe words were

were not there, or at leaſt, not this meaning; and ſo to ſhew their meaning out of other places more pregnant.

§. 7. And I promiſe, that whenſoever an equal conſent of Fathers can be ſhewed for any thing, as I can ſhew for this, I will believe it as firmly as I do this.

§. 8. But this is not the Anſwerers part, to propound doubts and difficulties, but to ſatisfie the proof objected.

§. 9. And if this courſe be any more taken, I will ſave my ſelf all farther labour in a buſineſs ſo likely to be endleſs.

§. 10. His ſecond Anſwer to the places is wholly impertinent; for therein would he diſprove them from watching a neceſſity of reſting in the judgment of the *Roman Church*; whereas I produced them only to ſhew, that among ſeveral Societies of Chriſtians, only *one* can be the *Catholick*; and againſt this his ſecond Anſwer ſaith nothing.

§. 11. In his third Anſwer he makes ſome ſhew of reply to the Authorities themſelves; but he commits a double Error: One, that he impoſes upon me a wrong concluſion to be proved, as will appear by comparing my concluſion in my Paper, with the concluſion he would appoint me.

§. 12. Another, that he impoſes upon the Authorities a wrong Interpretation, no way grounded in the words themſelves, nor in the places whence they were taken, nor in any other places of the ſame Fathers, but meerly forged out of his own Brain. For firſt, the places do not only ſay, that the Societies of Hereticks and Schiſmaticks are no part of the Church; but that the Church cannot be divided into more Societies than *one*; and they account Societies divided, which are either of a diverſe Faith or a diverſe Communion. Neither do they define *Hereticks* or *Schiſmaticks* in that manner as he does.

§. 13. For an *Heretick* in their Language is he, that oppoſes partinaciouſly the Common Faith of the Church: and a *Schiſmatick*, he that ſeparates from the *Catholick* Communion; never making any mention at all of the cauſe.

§. 14.

§. 14. And if his definition of a *Schismatick* may ſtand, then certainly there was no *Schiſmatick* ever in the World, nor none are at this day: for none did, none does ſeparate without ſome pretence of Error, or unlawfulneſs in the Conditions of the Churches Communion.

§. 15. And ſo I expect both a fuller and directer anſwer to my Argument, without excurſions, or diverſions into any other matter, till the judgment of Antiquity be cleared in this point.

Mr. *Chillingworths* Anſwer.

Ad §. 1. The *Minor* of my Argument, you ſay, is very weak, being grounded upon a falſe Suppoſition, That a Proteſtant could name no other Church profeſſing a diverſe Faith from the *Greek*, which was the *Catholick* Church: And your reaſon is, becauſe he might name the *Roman*. But in earneſt, Mr. *Lewgar*, do you think that a Proteſtant remaining a Proteſtant, can eſteem the *Roman* Church to be the Catholick Church? or do you think to put tricks upon us, with taking your propoſition one while *in ſenſu compoſito*, another while *in ſenſu diviſo*? For if your meaning was, that a Proteſtant not remaining, but ceaſing to be a Proteſtant, might name the *Roman* for the *Catholick*; ſo I ſay alſo to your diſcourſe, that a Proteſtant ceaſing to be a Proteſtant, might name a *Greek* to be the *Catholick* Church; and if there were any neceſſity to find out one Church of one denomination, as the *Greek*, the *Roman*, the Abyſſine, which *one* muſt be the *Catholick*? I ſee no reaſon, but he might pitch upon the *Greek* Church, as well as the *Roman*; I am ſure your diſcourſe proves nothing to the contrary. In ſhort, thus I ſay, if a *Grecian* ſhould go about to prove to a Proteſtant, that his Church is the *Catholick*, by ſaying (as you do for the *Roman*) ſome one was ſo before *Luther*, and you can name no other, therefore ours is ſo: Whatſoever may be anſwered to him, may be anſwered to you. For as you ſay, a Proteſtant, ceaſing to be a Proteſtant, may name to him the *Roman*; ſo I ſay, a Proteſtant, ceaſing to be a Proteſtant, may name to you the *Grecian*. If you

you ſay, a Proteſtant, remaining a Proteſtant, can name no other but the *Roman*, for the *Catholick*; I may (very ridiculouſly I confeſs, but yet as truly) ſay, he can name no other but the *Grecian*. If you ſay, he cannot name the *Greek Church* neither, remaining a Proteſtant; I ſay likewiſe, neither remaining a Proteſtant, can he name the *Roman* for the *Catholick*. So the Argument is equal in all reſpects on both ſides; and therefore either concludes for both parts (which is impoſſible, for then contradictions ſhould be both true) or elſe (which is certain) it concludes for neither. And therefore I ſay, your ground you build on, That before *Luther* ſome Church of one denomination was the *Catholick* (if it were true, as it is moſt falſe) would not prove your intent. It would deſtroy perhaps our Church, but it would not build yours. It would prove peradventure, that we muſt not be Proteſtants, but it will be far from proving that we muſt be *Papiſts*. For after we have left being Proteſtants (I tell you again that you may not miſtake) there is yet no neceſſity of being *Papiſts*; no more than if I go out of *England*, there is a neceſſity of going to *Rome*. And thus much to ſhew the poorneſs of your ground, if it were true. Now in the ſecond place, I ſay it is falſe, neither have you proved any thing to the contrary.

Ad §. 2. You ſay, the Authorities you have produced, ſhew to any that conſider them well, That the Church could never be divided into more Societies than *one*; and you mean (I hope) *one* in external Communion, or elſe you dally in ambiguities; and then I ſay, I have well conſidered the alledged authorities, and they appear to me to ſay no ſuch thing; but only, that the Societies of Hereticks and Schiſmaticks are no true members of the Church: Whereas I put the caſe of two ſuch Societies, which were divided in external Communion by reaſon of ſome overvalued difference between them, and yet were neither of them Heretical or Schiſmatical. To this I know you could not anſwer, but only by ſaying, That this ſuppoſition was impoſſible; *viz.* That of two Societies divided in external Communion, neither ſhould be Heretical nor Schiſmatical;

Schismatical; and therefore I desired you to prove by one convincing Argument, that this is impossible. This you have not done, nor I believe can do; and therefore all your places fall short of your intended conclusion; and if you would put them into Syllogistical form, you should presently see you conclude from them Sophistically in that fallacy, which is called *A dicto secundum quid, ad dictum Simpliciter.* Thus, — No two divided Societies, whereof one is Heretical or Schismatical, can be both members of the *Catholick Church:* therefore simply no two divided Societies can be so: the Antecedent I grant, which is all that your places say, as you shall see anon; but the consequence is Sophistical, and therefore that I deny: It is no better nor worse than if you should argue thus; No true divided Societies, whereof one is Out-lawed and in Rebellion, are both members of the same Commonwealth; therefore simply no two divided Societies.

But against this you pretend, That the alledged places say not only, that the Societies of Hereticks and Schismaticks are no parts of the Church; but that the Church cannot be divided into more Societies than *one*: And they account Societies divided, which are either of a diverse Faith, or of a diverse Communion: This is that which I would have proved, but as yet I cannot see it done. There be Eleven Quotations in all; seven of them speak expressly and formally of division made by Hereticks and Schismaticks, *viz.* 1. 3, 4. 7. 9, 10, 11. Three other of them, (*viz.* 5, 6. 8.) though they use not the word, yet Mr. *Lewgar* knows they speak of the *Donatists*, which were Schismaticks; and that by the relative particles *you* and *them* are meant the *Donatists*. And lastly, the second, Mr. *Lewgar* knows, says nothing but this, That an Hereticks cannot be accounted of that one Flock, which is the Church.

But to make the most of them that can be: The first saith, the Unity of the Church cannot be separated at all, nor divided. This I grant, but then I say, every difference does not in the sight of God divide this Unity: for then diversity of Opinions should do it; and so the *Jesuits* and

and *Dominicans* ſhould be no longer members of the ſame Church. Or if every difference will not do it, why muſt it of neceſſity be always done by difference in Communion, upon an inſufficient ground, yet miſtaken for ſufficient? (for ſuch only I ſpeak of.) Sure I am, this place ſays no ſuch matter. The next place ſaies, the Flock is but one; and all the reſt, that the Church is but *one*, and that Hereticks and Schiſmaticks are not of it; which certainly was not the thing to be proved, but that of this one Flock, of this one Church, two Societies divided without juſt cauſe in Communion, might not be true and lively members; both in one Body Myſtical in the ſight of God, though divided in Unity in the ſight of men: It is true indeed, whoſoever is ſhut out from the Church on Earth, is likewiſe cut off from it before God in Heaven: but you know it muſt be *Clave non errante*; when the cauſe of abſciſſion is true and ſufficient.

Ad §. 3. If you ſay ſo, *you ſay no more than the Fathers*: but what evaſions and tergiverſations are theſe? Why do you put us off with *ifs* and *ands*? I beſeech you tell me, or at leaſt him that deſires to reap ſome benefit by our Conference, directly and Categorically, —— Do you ſay ſo, or do you ſay, it is not ſo? Were the Excommunicated Churches of *Aſia* ſtill members of the *Catholick Church* (I mean in Gods account) or were they not? but all damned for that horrible Hereſie of celebrating the Feaſt of *Eaſter* upon a diverſe day from the Weſtern Churches? If you mean honeſtly and fairly, anſwer directly to this Queſtion, and then you ſhall ſee what will come of it. Aſſure your ſelf, you have a Wolf by the Ears: If you ſay they were, you overthrow your own concluſions, and ſay that Churches divided in Communion may both be members of the *Catholick*. If they were not; then ſhall we have Saints and Martyrs in Heaven, which were no members of the *Catholick Roman Church*.

As for *Irenæus* his μὴ σχίσμειν, and *Ruffinus* his —— *Abſcindere ab unitate corporis*; they imply no more but this at the moſt; That *Victor* (*quantum in ſe fuit*) did cut them off from the *External* Communion of the *Catholick Church*;

ſuppoſing, that for their Obſtinacy in their Tradition, they had cut themſelves off from the *internal* Communion of it: but that this ſentence of *Victors* was ratified in Heaven, and that they were indeed cut off from the myſtical Body of Chriſt, ſo far was *Irenæus* from thinking, that he, and in a manner all the other Biſhops, reprehended *Victor* for pronouncing this Sentence on them, upon a cauſe ſo inſufficient: which how they could ſay, or poſſibly think of a Sentence ratified by God in Heaven, and not reprehend God himſelf, I deſire you to inform me: and if they did not intend to reprehend the Sentence of God himſelf, together with *Victors*, then I believe it will follow unavoidably, that they did not conceive, nor believe *Victors* Sentence to be ratified by God; and conſequently did not believe, that theſe excommunicated Churches were not in Gods account true members of the Body of Chriſt.

Ad §. 4. And here again, we have another ſubterfuge, by a Verbal diſtinction between Excommunication, and voluntary ſeparation: As if the ſeparation, which the Church of *Rome* made in *Victors* time from the *Aſian Churches*, were not a voluntary ſeparation; or as if the Churches of *Aſia*, did not voluntarily do that which was the cauſe of their ſeparation; or as if (though they ſepated not themſelves indeed, conceiving the cauſe to be inſufficient) they did not yet remain voluntarily ſeparated, rather than conform themſelves to the Church of *Rome*: Or laſtly, as if the *Grecians* of Old, or the Proteſtants of Late, might not pretend as juſtly as the *Aſian* Churches, that their Separation too was not voluntarily, but of neceſſity; for that the Church of *Rome* required of them under pain of Excommunication ſuch conditions of her Communion, as were neither neceſſary nor lawful to be performed.

Ad §. 5. And here again the matter is ſtreightned by another limitation. Both ſides (ſay you) muſt claim to be the Church: but what then, if one of them only claim (though vainly) to be the Church, and the other content it ſelf with being a part of it? Theſe then it ſeems

for

(for any thing you have ſaid to the contrary) may be both members of the *Catholick Church*: And certainly this is the caſe now, between the Church of *England* and the Church of *Rome*: and for ought I know, was between the Church of *Rome* and the Church of *Greece*: For I believe, it will hardly be proved, that the Excommunication between them was mutual; nor that the Church of *Greece* eſteems it ſelf the whole Church, and the Church of *Rome* no Church but it ſelf a ſound member of the Church, and that a corrupted one.

Again, whereas you ſay, the Fathers ſpeak of a voluntary ſeparation; certainly they ſpeak of any Separation by Hereticks; and ſuch were (in *Victors* judgment) the Churches of *Aſia*, for holding an opinion contrary to the Faith, as he eſteemed: Or if he did not, why did he cut them from the Communion of the Church? But the true difference is, The Fathers ſpeak of thoſe, which by your Church are eſteemed Hereticks, and are ſo; whereas the *Aſian* Churches were by *Victor* eſteemed Hereticks, but were not ſo.

Ad §. 6. But their Authorities produced ſhew no more, than what I have ſhewed; that the Church is but one in excluſion of Hereticks and Schiſmaticks; and not that two particular Churches divided by miſtake upon ſome overvalued difference, may not be both parts of the *Catholick*.

Ad §. 7. But I deſire you to tell me, whether you will do this, if the Doctrines produced and confirmed by ſuch a conſent of Fathers, happen to be in the judgment of the Church of *Rome*, either not *Catholick*, or abſolutely Heretical. If you will undertake this, you ſhall hear farther from me: But if, when their places are produced, you will pretend (as ſome of your ſide do) that ſurely they are corrupted, having neither reaſon nor ſhew of reaſon for it; unleſs this may paſs for one (as perhaps it may, where reaſons are ſcarce) that they are againſt your Doctrine; or if you will ſay, they are to be interpreted according to the pleaſure of your Church, whether their words will bear it or no; then I ſhall but loſe my Labour;

for this is not to try your Church by the Fathers, but the Fathers by your Church.

The Doctrines which I undertake to justifie, by a greater consent of Fathers than here you produce, for instance shall be these.

1. That Gods Election supposeth prescience of mans Faith and perseverance.

2. That God doth not predetermine men to all their Actions.

3. That the *Pope* hath no power in temporalties over Kings either directly or indirectly.

4. That the Bishop of *Rome* may Err in his publick determinations of matters of Faith.

5. That the B. *Virgin* was guilty of Original sin.

6. That the B. *Virgin* was guilty of actual sin.

7. That the Communion was to be administred to the Laity in both kinds.

8. That the reading of the Scripture was to be denied to no man.

9. That the Opinion of the Millenaries is true.

10. That the Eucharist is to be administred to Infants.

11. That the substance of Bread and Wine remains in the Eucharist of her Consecration.

12. That the Souls of the Saints departed enjoy not the Vision of God before the Last day.

13. That at the day of judgment, all the Saints shall pass through a purging fire.

All these propositions are held by your Church either Heretical, or at least not *Catholical*; and yet in this promise of yours you have undertaken to believe them as firmly, as you now do this, That two divided Societies cannot be both members of the *Catholick Church*.

Ad §. 8. Is it not then the Answerers part to shew, that the proofs pretended are indeed no proofs? and doth not he prove no proofs (at least in your mouth) who undertakes to shew, that an equal or greater number of the very same witnesses is rejected by your selves in many other things? Either the consent of the Fathers, in any Age or Ages, is infallible, and then you are to reject

ject it in nothing; or it is not so, and then you are not to urge it in any thing: As if the Fathers Testimonies against us were Swords and Spears, and against you bulrushes.

Ad §. 9. In effect as if you should say, If you answer not as I please, I will dispute no longer. But you remember the proverb, —— will think of it. —— *Occasionem quærit, qui cupit discedere.*

Ad §. 10. I pray tell me, Is not *Therefore* a note of an Illation, or a conclusion? And is not your last *therefore this, Therefore her judgment is to be rested in?* which though it be not your first conclusion, yet yours it is, and you may not declaim it: and it is so near of kin to the former (in your judgment I am sure) that they must stand or fall together: therefore he that speaks pertinently for the disproving of the one, cannot speak impertinently towards the disproving the other: and therefore you cannot so shift it off, but of necessity you must answer the Argument there urged, or confess it ingenuously to be unanswerable.

Or if you will not answer any thing, where the contradiction of your first conclusion is not in terms inferred, then take it thus: If S. *Cyprian* and S. *Austin* did not think it necessary in matters of Faith to rest in the judgment of the *Roman* Church and the adherents of it; Then either they thought not the *Catholick Churches* judgment necessary to be rested on, or they thought not *that* the *Catholick Church.* But the Antecedent is true, and undeniably proved so by their Actions, and the consequence Evident: Therefore the consequent must be true in one or other part: But you will not say the former is true; it remains therefore, the latter must be, and that is —— That S. *Austin* and S. *Cyprian* did not think the Church of *Rome* and the adherents of it to be the Catholick Church.

Ad §. 11. But I tell you now, and have already told you, that in our discourse before Mr. *Skinner* and Dr. *Sheldon* I answered your Major, as then you framed your Argument, as now your Minor thus — If you understand by

by *one company* of Christians, *one* in External Communion, I deny your Major. For I say, that two several Societies of Christians, which do not externally communicate together, may be both parts of the same Catholick Church: and what difference there is between this, and the conclusion I told you, you should have proved, I do not well understand.

Ad §. 12. And is it possible you should say so, when every one of the places carry this sense in their forehead, and 7 of the 11 in terms expres it —— That they intended only to exclude Hereticks and Schismaticks from being parts of the Church: For if they did not, against whom did they intend them? *Pagans* lay no claim to the Church, therefore not against them: *Catholicks* they did not intend to exclude: I know not who remains besides, but Hereticks and Schismaticks. Besides the frequent opposition in them between —— *One Church* on the one side, and Hereticks and Schismaticks; who sees not, that in these places they intended to exclude only these pretenders out of the Churches Unity?

Lastly, whereas you say, that the places say —— That the Church cannot be divided; and that they account those divided who are of a diverse Faith, or a diverse Communion: I tell you, that I have read them over and over, and unless my Eyes deceive, they say not one word of a *diverse Communion.*

Ad §. 13. Whereas a *Heretick* in your Language, is he that oppoeth pertinaciously the common Faith of the Church; —— In mine —— He is such a one, as holds an Error against Faith with Obstinacy: Verily a monstrous difference between these definitions. To oppose and hold against (I hope) are all one: *Faith* and the *common Faith of the Church,* sure are not very different: *pertinaciously* and *with Obstinacy,* methinks might pass for Synonimous; and seeing the parts agree so well, methinks the Total should not be at great hostility. And for the definition of a *Schismatick,* if you like not mine (which yet I give you out of a Father) I pray take your own; and then shew me, (if you mean to do any thing) that where-

soever

ſoever there are two Societies of Chriſtians, differing in external Communion, one of them moſt be of neceſſity either Heretical, or Schiſmatical in your own ſenſe of theſe words. To the contrary, I have ſaid already, (and ſay it now again, that you may not forget it) the *Roman* and the *Aſian* Churches in *Victors* time, the *Roman* and the *African* in S. *Stephens* time differed in external Communion; and yet neither of them was *Heretical*; For they did not oppoſe pertinaciouſly the commonFaith of theChurch: Neither of them was *Schiſmatical*; for they did not ſeparate (never making mention of the cauſe at all) but were ſeparated by the *Roman* Church, and that upon ſome cauſe, though it were not ſufficient.

Ad §. 14. The *Donatiſt* did ſo (as *Facundus Hermianenſis* teſtifies:) but you are abuſed, I believe, with not diſtinguiſhing between theſe two — They did pretend, that the Church required of them ſome unlawful thing among the conditions of her Communion: and they did pretend, that it was unlawful for them to communicate with the Church. This I confeſs they did pretend; but it was in regard of ſome Perſons in the Church, with whom they thought it unlawful to communicate: But the former they did not pretend, (I mean while they continued meer Schiſmaticks,) *viz.* That there was any Error in the Church, or impiety in her publick ſervice of God: And this was my meaning in ſaying, — A Schiſmatick is he, which ſeparates from the Church without pretence of Error, or unlawfulneſs in the conditions of her Communion: Yet if I had left out the term *unlawfulneſs*, the definition had been better, and not obnoxious to this Cavillation; and ſo I did in the ſecond Paper which I ſent you for your direction; which if you had dealt candidly, you ſhould have taken notice of.

Ad §. 15. I have replied (as I think) fully to every part and particle of your Argument. Neither was the Hiſtory of S. *Cyprians* and S. *Auſtins* oppoſition to the Church of *Rome* an excurſion or diverſion; but a cleer demonſtation of the contradictory of your concluſion: (*viz. That the* Roman *Church*, &c. *and therefore her judgment not to be re-*

ſted

ſted upon) For an anſwer hereto I ſhall be very importunate with you; and therefore, if you deſire to avoid trouble, I pray come out of my debt as ſoon as may be.

If it be ſaid, that my Argument is not contradictory to your concluſion; becauſe it ſhews only, that the *Roman* Church with her adherents was not in S. *Cyprians* or S. *Auſtins* time the Catholick Church, but was at the time before *Luther*; I ſay, to conclude the one is to conclude the other. For certainly, if it were then at *Luthers* time ſo, it was always ſo; if it was not always, it was not then: for if it be of the eſſence, or neceſſary to the Church (as is pretended) to be a Society of Chriſtians joyned in Communion with the Church and Biſhop of *Rome*; then did it always agree to the Church; and therefore in S. *Cyprians* and S. *Auſtins* time, as well as at *Luthers* riſing: if it were not always, particularly not in S. *Cyprians* time, of the Eſſence or neceſſary to the Church to be ſo; then it was impoſſible the Church ſhould acquire this Eſſence, or this property afterwards, and therefore impoſſible it ſhould have it at the time of *Luthers* riſing. *Neceſſarium eſt, quod non aliquando ineſt, aliquando non ineſt, alicui ineſt, alicui non ineſt; ſed quod ſemper & omni.* Ariſt. Poſt. Analyt.

Again, every Sophiſter knows, that of Particulars nothing can be concluded; and therefore he that will ſhew, that the Church of *Rome* and the adherents of it was the Catholick Church at *Luthers* riſing; He muſt argue thus; —— It was always ſo, therefore then it was ſo: Now this Antecedent is overthrown by any Inſtance to the contrary; and ſo the firſt Antecedent being proved falſe, the firſt conſequent cannot but be falſe; for what Reaſon can be imagined, that the Church of *Rome* and the Adherents of it, was not the whole Catholick Church at S. *Cyprians* time, and was at *Luthers* riſing? If you grant (as I think you cannot deny) that a Church divided from the Communion of the *Roman*, may be ſtill in truth and in Gods account a part of the Catholick (which is the thing we ſpeak of:) then I hope Mr. *Lewgars* Argument from Unity of Communion is fallen to the ground; and it will be no good Plea to ſay,

Some

Some one Church, not consisting of divers Communions, was the Catholick Church at *Luthers* rising:

No one Church can be named to be the Catholick Church, but the *Roman:*

Therefore the *Roman* Church was the Catholick at *Luthers* rising.

For Mr. *Lewgar* hath not nor cannot prove the Major of this syllogism certainly true; but to the contrary I have proved, that it cannot be certainly true, by shewing divers instances, wherein divers divided Communions have made up the Catholick Church: and therefore not the dividing of the Communions, but the cause and ground of it, is to be regarded, whether it be just and sufficient, or unjust and insufficient.

Neither is the Bishop or Church of *Rome*, with the Adherents of it, an infallible Judge thereof; for it is evident, both he and it have erred herein divers times; which I have evinced already by divers examples, which I will not repeat; but add to them one confessed by Mr. *Lewgar* himself in his discourse upon the Article of the Catholick Church, pag. 84. *S.* Athanasius *being excommunicated (though by the* [a] *whole Church) yet might remain a member of Christs body, (not visible, for that is impossible,* [b] *that a person cut off from visible Communion, though unjustly, should be a visible member of the Church, but) by invisible Communion, by reason of the invalidity of the sentence; which being unjust, is valid enough to visible excision, but not farther.*

[a] How by the whole Church, when himself was part of it, and communicated still with divers other parts of it?

[b] What not to them who know and believe him to be unjustly Excommunicated?

II. *A Diſcourſe againſt the Infallibility of the* Roman Church, *with an Anſwer to all thoſe Texts of Scripture that are alledged to prove it.*

THE Condition of Communion with the Church of *Rome*, without the performance whereof no man can be received into it, is this, That he believe firmly and without doubting, whatſoever that Church requires him to believe.

It is impoſſible that any man ſhould certainly believe any thing, unleſs that thing be either evident of it ſelf (as that twice two are four; that every whole is greater than a part of it ſelf) or unleſs he have ſome certain reaſon (at leaſt ſome ſuppoſed certain reaſon) and infallible guide for his belief thereof.

The Doctrins which the Church of *Rome* requireth to be believed are not *evident of themſelves*; for then every one would grant them at firſt hearing without any further proof. He therefore that will believe them, muſt have ſome certain and infallible ground whereupon to build his belief of them.

There is no other ground for a mans belief of them, eſpecially in many points, but only an aſſurance of the Infallibility of the Church of *Rome*.

Now this point of that Churches Infallibility, is not evident of it ſelf; for then no man could chuſe but in his heart believe it without farther proof. Secondly, it were in vain to bring any proof of it, as vain as to light a Candle to ſhew men the Sun. Thirdly, it were impoſſible to bring any proof of it, ſeeing nothing can be more evident, than that which of it ſelf is evident: and nothing can be brought in proof of any thing which is not more evident than that matter to be proved: But now experience teacheth that millions there are, which have heard talk of the Infallibility of the *Roman* Church, and yet do not believe that the defenders of it do not think it either vain or impoſſible to go about to prove it; and from hence it follows plainly, that this point is not evident of it ſelf.

Neither

Neither is there any other certain ground for any mans belief of it: or if there be, I desire it may be produced, as who am ready and most willing to submit my judgment to it, fully perswaded that none can be produced, that will endure a severe and impartial examination.

If it be said, The *Roman* Church is to be believed infallible because the Scripture says it is so.

1. I demand how shall I be assured of the Texts that be alledged, that they are indeed Scripture, that is, the Word of God? And the answer to this must be either because the Church tells me so, or some other: if any other be given, then all is not finally resolved into, and built upon that Churches Authority; and this answer then I hope a Protestant may have leave to make use of, when he is put to that perillous Question; *How know you the Scripture to be the Scripture?* If the answer be, because the Church tells me so: my reply is ready; that to believe that Church is infallible, because the Scriptures say so: and that the Scripture is the word of God, because the same Church says so, is nothing else but to believe the Church is infallible, because the Church says so, which is infallible.

2. I could never yet from the beginning of *Genesis*, to the end of the *Apocalypse*, find it written so much as once in expres terms, or equivalently, that the Church in subordination to the Sea of *Rome* shall be always infallible.

3. If it be said, that this is drawn from good consequence from Scripture truly interpreted; I demand, what certain ground have I to warrant me, that this consequence is good and this interpretation true: and if answer be made, that reason will tell me so: I reply, 1. That this is to build all upon my own reason and private interpretation. 2. I have great reason to fear, that reason assures no man, that the infallibility of the Church of *Rome* may be deduced from Scripture, by good and firm consequence.

4. If it be said, that a Consent of Fathers do so interpret the Scripture. I answer, 1. That this is most false and cannot without impudence be pretended, as I am ready to justifie to any indifferent Hearer. 2. I demand, who shall be judge whether the Fathers mean as is pretended.

If it be ſaid, reaſon will tell me ſo: I ſay, 1. this is falſe. 2. This is again to do that which is objected to Proteſtants for ſuch a horrid crime, that is, to build all finally upon reaſon.

If it be ſaid, they are ſo interpreted by the Catholick Church; I demand, whether by the Catholick Church be meant that onely that is in ſubordination to the Biſhop of *Rome*, or any other with that, or beſides that. If any other, it is falſe and impudent to pretend that they ſo underſtand the Fathers or Scriptures: If that only, then this is to ſay, that that Church is infallible, becauſe it may be deduced from Scripture that it is ſo; and to prove that it may be deduced from Scripture, becauſe the Fathers ſay ſo; and to prove the Fathers do ſay and mean ſo, becauſe the Church of *Rome* ſays they do ſo. And then what a ſtir and trouble was here to no purpoſe; why was it not rather ſaid plainly at the beginning; The Church of *Rome* is certainly infallible, becauſe ſhe her ſelf ſays ſo; and ſhe muſt ſay true becauſe ſhe is infallible: and that is as much to ſay as unleſs you grant me the Queſtion, I neither can nor will diſpute with you.

If it is ſaid, indeed the Fathers do not draw this doctrin from Scripture, but yet they affirm it with a full conſent, as a matter of Tradition. I reply. 1. That this pretence alſo is falſe, and that upon tryal it will not appear to have any colour of probability to any who remembers, that it is the preſent *Roman* Church, and not the Catholick Church whoſe infallibility is here diſputed. 2. I demand, who ſhall be judge, whether the Fathers do indeed affirm this or no: If reaſon, then again we are fallen upon that dangerous Rock, that all muſt be reſolved into private reaſon: If the Church I ask again, what Church is meant? If the Church of the *Grecians* or *Abyſſines* or Proteſtants, or any other but the *Roman*, it is evident they deny it. If the Church of *Rome*, then we are again very near the head of the Circle. For I ask, how ſhall I be aſſured this Church will not err and deceive me in interpreting the Fathers; and th Anſwer muſt be either none, or this, that the Churcl infallible.

Obj.

Obj. If it be ſaid, that the Infallibility of the *Roman* Church would yield the Church ſo many commodities, and that the want of an infallible Church to guide men in the way to Heaven, would bring ſo many miſchiefs upon the world, that it cannot be thought but that God out of his love to men, hath appointed this Church as an infallible guide to all other Churches; ſeeing it is ſo neceſſary there ſhould be ſome ſuch guide, and ſo evident there is no other.

Anſ. I anſwer; that this argument would ſerve the Church of *Greece*, or *England*, or *Geneva*, to prove it ſelf infallible, and the guide of all other Churches, would they but take upon them to be ſo. For every one might ſay for it ſelf; It is neceſſary there ſhould be ſome Guide; it is evident there is no other; *Ergo* I am appointed by God to be that Guide. The ſame argument any man might uſe, to make himſelf Monarch of any popular State: for firſt he might repreſent unto them the commodities of a Monarchy, and the miſchiefs of a Democracy: then he might ſay, That God ſurely out of his Love to them hath appointed ſome remedy for their inconveniences: And laſtly, that he hath ordained no other to redreſs them but himſelf, and then conclude, that he alone muſt of neceſſity be the man appointed to rule over them.

I anſwer Secondly, that here alſo we muſt reſolve all into Reaſon and the private Spirit, or that we are ſtill in the Circle. For I demand, how do you know that theſe pretended commodities are to be compaſſed, and theſe pretended miſchiefs are to be avoided, only by the Infallibility of the Church of *Rome* or ſome other Church, and not by any other means which God hath provided. If you ſay, reaſon tells you ſo; I ſay 1. This is to make reaſon your laſt and loweſt foundation. 2. I aſſure you Reaſon tells me no ſuch matter, and yet I know that I am as willing to hear it as you are. If you ſay, the Church tells you ſo, and ſhe is infallible; this, I ſay, is to prove the Church infallible becauſe ſhe is ſo.

Thirdly, I demand, How it is poſſible you ſhould know, that theſe pretended commodities might not be gained, and

and theſe miſchiefs which you fear avoided, without any aſſiſtance of the Church of *Rome*'s infallibility, if all men in the world did believe the Scripture, and live according to it, and would require no more of others, but to do ſo? If you ſay, that notwithſtanding this, there would be no unity in Doctrin: I anſwer 1. It is impoſſible you ſhould know this; conſidering that there are many places in Scripture, which do more than problably import, that the want of piety in living, is the cauſe of want of unity in believing. 2. That there would be unity of Opinion in all things neceſſary: and that in things not neceſſary unity of Opinion is not neceſſary. But laſtly, that notwithſtanding differences in theſe things of leſſer importance, there might and would be unity of Communion, unity of charity and affection, which is one of the greateſt bleſſings which the world is capable of; abſolute unity of opinion being a matter rather to be deſired than hoped for.

Obj. Againſt this it has been objected, that the Scripture cannot be the guide, becauſe many men have uſed their beſt endeavors to follow it, and yet have fallen, ſome into *Arianiſm*, others into *Pelagianiſm*, others into other damnable Hereſies, and how can I ſecure any man, but he may do the like?

Anſ. To this I anſwer, by diſtinguiſhing the perſons which are pretended to have made uſe of this Guide, and yet to have fallen into Hereſie, that they were either ſuch as did love the truth ſincerely and above all things, as did ſeek it diligently and with all their power, to this intent that they might conform their belief and life unto it; ſuch as following S. *Pauls* direction, did firſt try all things deliberately, and then choſe what in their conſcience they thought was beſt: or they were ſuch as for want of the love of the truth, God ſuffered to fall into ſtrong deluſions, to fall to a falſe Religion, becauſe they brought not forth the fruits of the true; to make ſhipwreck of their faith, becauſe they had caſt away a good conſcience; to have their Eyes blinded, and their light taken away, becauſe they made not the right uſe of it, but were idle and un-

unprofitable, and ſet their hearts upon vanity, and had only a form of Religion, but denied the effect of it in their lives and converſations; in a word, ſuch as were betrayed to their Error, and kept for ever in it, either by negligence in ſeeking the Truth, or unwillingneſs to find it, or by ſome other voluntary ſin: And for theſe I dare not flatter them with hope of pardon; but let me tell you, it is not the error of the underſtanding, but the ſin of their will that truly and properly damns them: But for the former I am confident, that nothing is more contumelious to the goodneſs of God, than to think that he will damn any ſuch; for he ſhould damn men that truly love him, and deſire to ſerve him, for doing that-which all things conſidered, was impoſſible for them not to do.

Obj. If it is ſaid, that pride of their own underſtanding made them not ſubmit to the Church of *Rome*, and to her guidance, and that for this, being a voluntary ſin, they may be juſtly damned.

Anſ. I anſwer, that whether the Church of *Rome* be the guide of all men is the Queſtion, and therefore not to be begged but proved: that the man we ſpeak of is very willing to follow this Guide, could he find any good ground to believe it is his Guide; and therefore the reaſon he follows her not, is not pride but ignorance: that as it is humility to obey thoſe whom God hath ſet over us, ſo it is credulity to follow every one that will take upon him to lead us: that if the *blind lead the blind*, not only the *leader* but the *follower* ſhall periſh: Laſtly, that the preſent Church of *Rome* pretends very little and indeed nothing of moment, to get the office of being Head and Guide of the Church, which Antichriſt when he cometh, may not and will not make uſe of, for the very ſame end and purpoſe; and therefore he had reaſon, not to be too ſudden and precipitate, in committing himſelf to the conduct of the Pope, for fear of miſtaking Antichriſt for the Vicar of Chriſt.

Obj. But in all Commonwealths, it is neceſſary there ſhould be not only a Law for men to live by, but alſo a living and ſpeaking Judge to decide their differences ariſing about.

about the various Interpretations of the Law, and otherwiſe Controverſies would be endleſs: therefore if ſuch a judge be ſo neceſſary in civil affairs, for the procuring and preſerving our temporal peace and happineſs; how much more neceſſary is he, for the deciding of thoſe Controverſies, that concern the ſaving and damning of our ſouls for ever.

Anſ. Hereunto I anſwer, 1. That if it were as evident and certain that God hath appointed the Pope or Church of *Rome* to be the Guide of Faith, and Judge of Controverſies, as that the King hath appointed ſuch a one to be Lord Chief Juſtice, the having of ſuch a Guide would be very available, for to preſerve the Church in Unity, and to conduct mens ſouls to Heaven: but a Judge that has no better title or evidence to his place, than the Pope has to that which he pretends to, a Judge that is doubtful and juſtly queſtionable whether he be the Judge or no, is in all probability likely to produce clean contrary effects, and to be himſelf one of the Apples of ſtrife, one of the greateſt ſubjects of Controverſie, and occaſion of diſſentions.

And to avoid this great inconvenience, if God had intended the Pope or Church of *Rome* for this great Office, certainly he would have ſaid ſo very plainly and very frequently; if not frequently, certainly ſometimes, once at leaſt he would have ſaid ſo in expreſs terms: but he does not ſay ſo, no not ſo much as once, nor any thing from whence it may be collected, with any ſure or firm conſequence: therefore if it be not certain, certainly it is very probable he never meant ſo.

Again, in Civil Controverſies the caſe can hardly be ſo put, that there ſhould be any neceſſity that the ſame man ſhould be Judge and Party: but in matters of Religion, wherein all have equal intereſt, every man is a party, and engaged to judge for temporal reſpects, this way or that way, and therefore not fit to be a Judge. But what then if he which was with ſo much clamor and ſo little reaſon vouched, for the Infallibility of the *Roman* Church, do tell you plainly, there is no living Judge on Earth appointed by God, to decide the Controverſies ariſing amongſt Chriſtians;

Christians; nor no way to determine them but Scripture. His words are expres and formal, and need no other commentary but a true interpretation.

Optatus Melevit. *lib.* 5. ad princip.

Vos dicitis, Licet; *nos, non* Licet: *inter Vestrum* Licet, *& nostrum* non Licet, *nutant & remigant animæ populorum. Nemo vobis credat, nemo nobis; omnes contentiosi homines sumus. Quærendi sunt judices: si Christiani, de utrâque parte dari non possunt: de foris quærendus est Judex. Si* Paganus, *non potest nosse Christiana Secreta: Si* Judæus, *inimicus est Christiani Baptismatis. Ergo in terris de hac re nullum poterit reperiri judicium: de cœlo quærendus est Judex. Sed ut quid pulsamus cœlum, cum habeamus hic in Evangelio Testamentum? Quia hoc loco rectè possunt terrenæ cœlestibus comparari; tale est, quod quivis hominum habens numerosos filios: His, quamdiu presens est, ipse imperat singulis; non est adhuc necessarium Testamentum. Sic & Christus, quamdiu præsens in terris fuit (quamvis nec modo desit) pro tempore quicquid necessarium erat, Apostolis imperavit. Sed quomodo terrenus pater cùm se in confinio senserit mortis, timens ne post mortem suam ruptâ pace litigent fratres, adhibitis testibus voluntatem suam de pectore morituro transfert in tabulas diù duraturas; & si fuerit inter fratres contentio nata, non itur ad tumulum, sed quæritur Testamentum, & qui in tumulo quiescit, tacitis de tabulis loquitur vivus. Is, cujus est testamentum, in cœlo est: Ergo voluntas ejus velut in Testamento sic in Evangelio inquiratur.*

That is, "You say such a thing is *Lawful*; we say it is "*Unlawful:* the minds of the People are doubtful and "wavering between your *lawful* and our *unlawful.* Let "no man believe either *you* or *us*; we are all contentious "men. We must seek therefore for Judges between us. "If Christians are to be our Judges; both sides will not af- "ford such. We must seek for a Judge abroad. If he be "a *Pagan,* he cannot know the secrets of Christianity: "If he be a *Jew,* he is an Enemy to Christian Baptism. "Therefore there is no judgment of this matter can be "found on Earth. We must seek for a Judge from Hea-

"ven. But to what end do we ſollicite Heaven, when "we have here in the Goſpel a Will and Teſtament? And "becauſe here we may fitly compare Earthly things with "Heavenly; The caſe is juſt as if a man had many Sons: "while he is preſent with them, he commands every one "what he will have done; and there is no need as yet of "making his laſt Will. So alſo Chriſt, as long as he was "preſent on Earth (though neither now is he wanting) "for a time commanded his Apoſtles, whatſoever was "neceſſary. But juſt as an Earthly Father, when he "feels his Death approaching, fearing leſt after his Death "the Brothers ſhould fall out and quarrel, he calls in Wit-"neſſes, and tranſlates his Will from his dying Heart into "Writing-Tables that will continue long after him: Now "if any controverſie ariſes among the Brothers; they do "not go to his Tomb, but conſult his laſt Will; and thus "he whilſt he reſts in his Grave, does ſpeak to them in thoſe "ſilent Tables as if he were alive. He whoſe Teſta-"ment we have, is in Heaven. Therefore we are to en-"quire his pleaſure in the Goſpel, as in his laſt Will and "Teſtament.

It is plain from hence, that he knew not of any living, ſpeaking, audible Judge, furniſhed with Authority and infallibility to decide this controverſie: had he known any ſuch aſſiſted with the Spirit of God for this purpoſe, it had been horrible impiety againſt God and the Churches peace, to ſay there was none ſuch: or the Spirit of God was not able by his aſſiſtance to keep this Judge from being hindred with partiality, from ſeeing the Truth. Had he thought the Biſhop of *Romes* ſpeaking *ex Cathedra* to be this Judge, now had been the time to have ſaid ſo: but he ſays directly the contrary, and therefore it is plain, he knew of no ſuch Authority he had.

Neither is there the like reaſon for a Judge finally and with Authority to determine controverſies in Religion and civil differences: For if the controverſie be about *Mine* and *Thine*, about Land or Money or any other thing, it is impoſſible that both I ſhould hold the poſſeſſion of it and my adverſary too: and one of us muſt do injury

to

to the other, which is not fit it ſhould be Eternal: But in matters of Doctrine the caſe is clean contrary; I may hold my opinion and do my Adverſary no wrong, and my Adverſary may hold his and do me none.

[*Texts of Scripture alledged for Infallibility.*]

The Texts alledged for it by *Cardinal Perron* and Mr. *Stratford,* are partly Prophecies of the *Old Teſtament,* partly promiſes of the *New.*

1. Eſa. 1. 26. *Thou ſhalt be called the City of Juſtice, the faithful City.*

2. Eſa. 52. 1. *Through thee ſhall no more paſs any that is uncircumciſed, or unclean.*

3. Eſa. 59. 21. *As for me, this is my Covenant with them, ſaith the Lord, my ſpirit that is upon thee, and my Words which I have put in thy mouth, ſhall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy ſeed, nor out of the mouth of thy ſeeds ſeed, ſaith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever.*

4. Eſa. 62. 6. *Upon thy Walls* Hieruſalem *I have appointed Watchmen all the day and all the night for ever, they ſhall not hold their peace.*

5. Jerem. 31. 33. *This ſhall be the Covenant which I will make with the Houſe of* Iſrael, *ſaith the Lord, I will give my Law in their Bowels, and in their Heart I will write it, and I will be their God, and they ſhall be my People.*

6. Ezek. 36. 27. *I will put my Spirit within you, and cauſe you to walk in my Statutes, and ye ſhall keep my judgments and do them.*

7. Ezek. 37. 26. *I will give my Sanctification in the midſt of them for ever.*

8. Oſe. 2. 19, 20. *I will diſpouſe thee to me for ever; and I will diſpouſe thee to me in Juſtice and judgment, and in mercy and commiſerations; I will Eſpouſe thee to me in Faith, and thou ſhalt know that I am the Lord.*

9. Cant. 4. 7. *Thou art all fair my Love, and there is no ſpot in thee.*

Now before we proceed further, let us reflect upon theſe places, and make the moſt of them for the behoof

of the *Roman* Church; and I believe it will then appear to any one not veil'd with prejudice, that not one of them reaches home to the concluſion intended, which is, That the *Roman* Church is infallible.

The firſt place perhaps would do ſomething, but that there are Three main exceptions againſt it. 1. That here is no evidence, not ſo much as that of probability, that this is here ſpoken of the Church of *Rome*. 2. That it is certain that it is not ſpoken of the Church of *Rome*; but of the Nation of the *Jews*, after their converſion, as is apparent from that which follows. *Zion ſhall be redeemed with judgment, and her converts with righteouſneſs.* 3. That it is no way certain, that whatſoever Society may be called, *the City of righteouſneſs, the faithful City*, muſt be infallible in all her Doctrine: with a great deal more probability, it might challenge from hence the privileg of being *Impeccable*; which yet *Roman Catholicks* I believe do not pretend to.

The Second place is liable to the ſame exceptions; the Church of *Rome* is not ſpoken of in it: but *Zion* and *Hieruſalem*; and it will *ſerve as well nay* better to prove *Impeccability* than *Infallibility*.

The third place is the *Achilles* for this opinion, wherein every writer Triumphs; but I wonder they ſhould do ſo; conſidering the Covenant here ſpoken of is made, not with the Church of *Rome*, but with *Zion* and them that turn from tranſgreſſion in *Jacob*, the words are: *And the Redeemer ſhall come out of* Zion, *and unto them that turn from tranſgreſſion in* Jacob *ſaith the Lord. As for me, this is my Covenant with them ſaith the Lord*; *My Spirit that is in thee and my Words*, &c. Now if the Church of *Rome* be *Zion* and they that turn from iniquity in *Jacob*, they may have Title to this Covenant; if not they muſt forbear, and leave it to the *Jews* after their Converſion; to whom it is appropriated by a more Infallible Interpreter than the *Pope*; I mean S. *Paul*, Rom. 11. 26. And it ſeems the Church of *Rome* alſo believes as much: for otherwiſe why does ſhe in the Margent of her Bible, ſend us to that place of S. *Paul* for an expoſition.

Read

Read the 4th place, and you ſhall find nothing can be made of it but this: that the Watchmen of *Hieruſalem* ſhall never ceaſe importuning God, for the ſending of the *Meſſias*: To this purpoſe ſpeaks the Prophet in *ver.* 1. *For* Zions *ſake I will not hold my peace,* and for *Hieruſalems ſake I will not reſt, until the righteouſneſs thereof go forth as brightneſs*: And the *Gentiles ſhall ſee thy righteouſneſs.* But the words following theſe that are objected, make it moſt evident, which are, *ye that make mention of the Lord keep not ſilence, and give him no reſt, till he eſtabliſh and till he make* Hieruſalem *a praiſe in the Earth.*

The 5th place had they ſet down entirely, for very ſhame they could not have urged it for the Infallibility of the *Roman* Church. The words are, *Behold the days come, ſaith the Lord, that I will make a new Covenant with the Houſe of* Iſrael, *and with the Houſe of* Judah; *not according to the Covenant which I made with their Fathers —— But this ſhall be the Covenant that I will make with the Houſe of* Iſrael —— *After thoſe days, ſaith the Lord, I will put my Law in their inward parts and write it in their Hearts, and I will be their God and they ſhall be my People; and they ſhall teach no more every man his Neighbour and every man his Brother, ſaying, know the Lord; for they ſhall all know me from the leaſt of them to the greateſt of them, ſaith the Lord.* And now I have tranſcribed the place, I think it ſuperfluous to make any other anſwer.

The ſame Anſwer and no other will I make alſo to the 6th place. The words are. *Therefore ſay unto the Houſe of* Iſrael; *thus ſaith the Lord God, I do not this for your ſakes O Houſe of* Iſrael, *but for my holy names ſake,* ver. 22. *I will take you from among the Heathen, and gather you out of all Countries, and will bring you into your own Land,* v. 24. *Then will I ſprinkle clean Water upon you,* ver. 25. *A new heart alſo will I give you,* ver. 26. *And I will put my Spirit in you and cauſe you to walk in my Statutes, and ye ſhall keep my judgments and do them,* ver. 27. *And ye ſhall dwell in the Land that I gave to your Fathers: I will alſo ſave you from all your uncleanneſſes, and I will call for the Corn and will encreaſe it, and lay no Famine upon you. And the deſolate Land*

ſhall

ſhall be tilled, ver. 34. *And they ſhall ſay, this Land that was deſolate, is become like the Garden of* Eden.

The 7th place alſo carries its anſwer in its forehead: *Thus ſaith the Lord God, behold I will take the Children of* Iſrael *from among the* Heathen *whether they be gone; and I will make them one Nation in the Land upon the mountains of* Iſrael: *and one King ſhall be King to them all,* &c. to the end of the Chapter. In all which place, he that can find a Syllable of the Church of *Rome,* he muſt have better eyes than I have.

The next (8th) place would be very pregnant for the Church of *Rome,* if of courteſie we would grant, that whatſoever is promiſed to *Iſrael,* is intended to them. As you may ſee in the place at large, from *ver.* 17. to the end of the Chapter.

The 9th and laſt place out of the *Canticles,* had it been urged by a Proteſtant; it would have been thought a ſufficient Anſwer to have ſaid, That Myſtical Texts are not fit to argue upon; but if this will not ſerve, then we anſwer. 1. That there is no mention nor intimation of the Church of *Rome.* 2. That it proves either too much or nothing at all: that is, that the *Roman* Church is impeccable, as well as infallible; unleſs we will ſay that Errors only are Spots, and impieties are not.

Out of the New Teſtament *they alledge theſe Texts.*

Matth. 16. 18. *Upon this Rock I will build my Church, and the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt it.*

But this is ſaid of the Catholick, not of the *Roman* Church: nor can it ever be proved that the Church in Communion with the See of *Rome* is the Catholick Church. Secondly, it ſays ſomething for the *perpetuity* of the Church, but not for the *Infallibility* of it: unleſs you will take for granted what can never be proved, That a Church that teaches any Erroneous Doctrine, is a Church no longer; which is all one, as if you ſhould ſay, a man that has the *Stone,* or *Gout,* or any other Diſeaſe, is not a man.

They urge, Matth. 28. 19, 20.

And I am with you all days, even unto the consummation of the World.

And here also if we will grant, 1. That by *you,* is meant you and only you of the Church of *Rome.* 2. That our Saviour has here obliged himself to assist, not only *Sufficienter,* but also *irresistibiliter,* not only to preserve in the Church a light of sufficient direction, as he provided a Star for the Wise Men, and a Pillar of Fire and a cloud for the conduct of the *Israelites*; but also compel or at least necessitate them to follow it. 3. That he will be with them, not only to keep them from all damnable and destructive Errors, but absolutely form all erroneous Doctrines: If these things I say were granted, some good might be done. But certainly these are μεγάλα λίαν αἰτήματα, too great favours to be lookt for by strangers: And yet if all this be granted, we should run into this inconvenience on the other side; that if the promise be absolute, not only the whole Church of *Rome*; not only a general Council; not the *Pope* alone; but every Bishop, every Priest, every one who is sent by Christ to Baptize and Preach the Gospel, might claim this assistance by vertue of Christs words, and consequently *Infallibility.*

They urge, Matth. 18. 17.

If he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the Heathen *and the* Publican. And here again the Church must be the Church of *Rome,* or we are as far to seek as ever. But what if by it be meant, which is most evident out of the place, every particular Church of Christians, whereunto any one Christian injured by another, may address himself for remedy. Certainly whosoever reads the place without prejudice, I am confident that he shall not deny, but that the sense of the Words is. That if any Christian injure another, and being first admonished of it by him in private; then by him before two or three

three Witneſſes; Laſtly, by the Church he lives in; and yet ſtill proceeds on obſtinately in doing injury to his Brother, he is to be eſteemed as a *Heathen*, or a *Publican*: and then if Infallibility may be concluded, what a multitude of Infallible Churches ſhall we have?

They urge, Matth. 18. 20.

Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midſt of them.

But this alſo either ſhoots ſhort, or over; either proves nothing, or too much: Either it proves not the Infallibility of the whole Church, or it proves the Infallibility of every part of it: Either not the Infallibility of General Councils, or the infallibility of particular Councils; for there two or three at leaſt are aſſembled in Chriſts name. But then beſides theſe two or three for ought I can ſee or gather from the Text, they may as well be of any other Church as the *Roman*.

They urge, Luke 10. 16.

He that heareth you heareth me, and he that deſpiſeth you deſpiſeth me.

But this will not do you any ſervice, unleſs of favour we grant, that *you* here, is *you* of the Church of *Rome*; and but very little if that be granted: for then every Biſhop, every Prieſt muſt be Infallible. For there is not the meaneſt of the Meſſengers of Chriſt, but this may be verified of him, That he that heareth him, heareth Chriſt, and he that deſpiſeth him, deſpiſeth Chriſt.

They urge out of John 14. *ver.* 15, 16.

I will ask my Father, and he will give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever, even the Spirit of Truth.

But here alſo, what warrant have we, by *you* to underſtand the Church of *Rome*: whereas he that compares *v.* 26. with

with this, ſhall eaſily perceive, that our Saviour ſpeaks only of the Apoſtles in their own perſons; for there he ſays going on in the ſame diſcourſe. *The Holy Ghoſt whom the Father will ſend in my name, he ſhall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatſoever I have ſaid to you:* which cannot agree but to the Apoſtles themſelves in perſon; and not to their Succeſſors, who had not yet been taught and therefore not forgotten any thing, and therefore could not have them brought to their remembrance. But what if it had been promiſed to them and their Succeſſors? had they no Succeſſors but them of the *Roman* Church? this indeed is pretended and cried up, but for proofs of it, *deſiderantur.*

Again, I would fain know whether there be any certainty, that every Pope is a good Chriſtian, or whether he may not be in the ſence of the Scripture, *of the World?* If not, how was it that *Bellarmine* ſhould have cauſe to think, that ſuch a rank of them went ſucceſſively to the Devil?

III. *A Conference, concerning the Infallibility of the* Roman *Church: Proving that the preſent Church of* Rome *either errs in her worſhipping the Bleſſed Virgin* Mary, *or that the Ancient Church did err in condemning the* Collyridians *as* Hereticks.

1. *Demand.* WHether the Infallibility of the *Roman* Church, be not the foundation of their Faith which are members of that Church?

Anſw. The Infallibility of the Church is (not the foundation but) a part of their Faith who are members of the Church. And the *Roman* Church is held to be the Church, by all thoſe who are members of it.

Reply. That which is the laſt Reaſon, why you believe the Scripture to be the written Word of God and unwritten Traditions his unwritten word; and this or that to be the true ſenſe of Scripture, that is to you the foundation of your Faith, and ſuch unto you is the Infallible Authority of the *Roman* Church. Therefore unto you it is not only a part of your faith, but alſo ſuch a part as is the foundation of all other parts. Therefore you are deceived if you think, there is any more oppoſition between being a part of the faith and the foundation of other parts of it; than there is between being a part of a houſe and the foundation of it. But whether you will have it the foundation of your faith, or only a part of it, for the preſent purpoſe it is all one.

2. *Demand.* Whether the Infallibility of the *Roman* Church be not abſolutely overthrown, by proving the *preſent Roman* Church is in error, or that the *Ancient* was?

Anſw. It is, if the Error be in thoſe things wherein ſhe is affirmed to be infallible; *viz.* in points of Faith.

Reply. And this here ſpoken of, whether it be lawful to offer Tapers and Incenſe to the honour of the Bleſſed Virgin, is I hope a Queſtion concerning a point of Faith.

3. *Demand.* Whether offering a Cake to the Virgin *Mary*, be not as lawful, as to offer Incenſe and Tapers and divers other oblations to the ſame Virgin?

Anſw. It is as lawful to offer a Cake to her honour as Wax-Tapers, but neither the one, nor the other may be offered to her, or her honour, as the term or object of the Action. For to ſpeak properly, nothing is offered to her or to her honour, but to God in the honour of the Bleſſed Virgin. For Incenſe, it is a foul ſlander that it is offered any way to the Bleſſed Virgin; for that incenſing which is uſed in the time of Maſs, is ever underſtood by all ſorts of people to be directed to God only.

Reply. If any thing be offered to her, ſhe is the Object of that oblation; as if I ſee water, and through water ſomething elſe, the water is the object of my ſight, though not the laſt object. If I honour the Kings Deputy, and by him the King, the Deputy is the object of my action, though not the final object: And to ſay theſe things may be

be offered to her, but not as to the object of the action, is to say they may be offered to her, but not to her. For what else is meant by the object of an action, but that thing on which the action is imployed, and to which it is directed?

If you say, that by the object of the action, you mean the final object only wherewith the action is terminated; you should then have spoken more properly and distinctly, and not have denied her simply to be the object of this action, when you mean only she is not such a kind of object: no more than you may deny a man to be a living creature, meaning only that he is not a horse.

Secondly, I say, it is not required of *Roman* Catholicks when they offer Tapers to the Saints, that by an actual intention they direct their action actually to God; but it is held sufficient, that they know and believe that the Saints are in Subordination and near Relation to God, and that they give this honour to the Saints because of this relation: And to God himself rather habitually and interpretative, than actually, expresly and formally. As many men honour the Kings Deputy, without having any present thought of the King, and yet their action may be interpreted an honour to the King, being given to his Deputy, only because he is his Deputy, and for his relation to the King.

Thirdly, I say, there is no reason or ground in the world, for any man to think, that the *Collyridians* did not chuse the Virgin *Mary* for the object of their worship, rather than any other Woman or any other Creature, meerly for her relation to Christ; and by consequence there is no ground to imagine, but that at least habitually and interpretative, they directed their action unto Christ, if not actually and formally. And *Ergo*, if that be a sufficient defence for the Papists, that they make not the Blessed Virgin the final object of their worship, but worship her not for her own sake, but for her relation unto Christ: *Epiphanius* surely did ill to charge the *Collyridians* with Heresie, having nothing to impute to them, but only that he was informed, that they offered a Cake to the honour of the Blessed Virgin, which honour yet they might, and without question did give unto her for her relation unto Christ,

and ſo made her not the laſt object and term of their worſhip: and from hence it is evident, that he conceived the very action it ſelf, ſubſtantially and intrinſically malitious, *i.e.* he believed it a ſin that they offered to her at all: and ſo by their action put her in the place of God, by giving unto her this worſhip proper to God; and not that they terminated their action finally in her, or did in very deed think her to be a God, and not a Creature.

But to ſpeak properly, you ſay, *nothing is offered to her or to her honour, but to God in honour of the Bleſſed Virgin.*

Belike then if through *Henly* I go from hence to *London*, I may not be ſaid properly to go to *Henly*, but only to *London:* or if through Water I ſee the Sand, I may not be properly ſaid to ſee the Water, but only the Sand. Away with ſuch ſhifting Sophiſtry; either leave your practice of offering to Saints if it be naught, or colour it not over with ſuch empty diſtinctions if it be good: Chriſt ſaith to his Apoſtles in regard of their relation to him, *He that heareth you heareth me, and he that deſpiſeth you deſpiſeth me:* and yet who doubts, but they that heard the Apoſtles did properly hear them, and they that deſpiſed them did properly deſpiſe them, though their action ſtaid not in them, but reached up to Heaven and to Chriſt himſelf. You pray to Saints and Angels, though you do not terminate your prayers in them; and yet I doubt not but your prayers to Saints, may be as properly called prayers, as thoſe you make to God himſelf. For though theſe be of a more excellent nature than they, yet do they agree in the general nature, that they are both prayers. As though a Man be a more excellent living creature than a horſe, yet he agrees with him in this, that both are living creatures. But if nothing be properly offered to her or to her honor, why do you in your ſixth Anſwer ſay, you may offer any thing to the Virgin *Mary*, by way of preſents and gifts by the doctrin of the *Roman* Church? Certainly he that offers by way of gift or preſent, offers as properly as he that offers by way of ſacrifice; as a horſe is as properly a living creature as a Man.

But

But if it were ſo as you ſay (which is moſt falſe) that you did not properly offer to the Bleſſed Virgin, but to God in honour of her; yet in my judgment, this would not qualifie or mend the matter but make it worſe. For firſt, who taught you, that in the time of the Goſpel (after the accompliſhment of the prediction, *ſacrifice and offering thou wouldeſt not but a body haſt thou prepared me:* after this Interpretation of it in the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews, He taketh away the firſt that he may eſtabliſh the ſecond)* that it is ſtill lawful to offer Tapers or Incenſe to God. Secondly, in my underſtanding, to offer to God in honour of the Virgin, is more derogatory from Gods honour, than to offer to her in the honour of God. For this is in my apprehenſion to ſubordinate God to her, to make her the terminating and final object of the action; to make God the way and her the end, and by and through God to conveigh the worſhip unto her.

But for incenſe, you ſay, *it is a foul ſlander, that it is offered any way to the Bleſſed Virgin.*

To this I anſwer, that your imputing ſlander to me, is it ſelf a ſlander: For 1. In your 5th Anſwer, you have given a clear intimation that you have never been out of *England*: ſo that you cannot certainly know, what is the practice of your Church in this point beyond Sea. And he that lives amongſt you, and has but half an Eye open and free from prejudice, cannot but ſee, that the *Roman* Religion is much more exorbitant in the general practice of it, than it is in the Doctrine publiſhed in Books of Controverſie; where it is delivered with much caution and moderation, nay cunning and diſſimulation that it may be the fitter to win and engage Proſelytes; who being once enſnared, though they be afterwards ſtartled with ſtrange and unlookt-for practices, yet a hundred to one, but they will rather ſtifle their Conſcience, and daſh all ſcruples againſt the pretended Rock of their Churches Infallibility, and blindly follow thoſe guides, to whoſe Conduct they have unadviſedly committed themſelves, than come off again with the ſhame of being reputed weak and inconſtant: ſo terrible an Idol is this vain nothing, *the opinion and cenſure of fooliſh men.* But

But to return again to you, I say your ignorance of the practice of the *Roman* Church beyond the Seas, does plainly convince that you have rashly and therefore slanderously charged me with the Crime of slander. As for your reason you add, consider it again, and you will see it is worth nothing. For what if incensing in time of Mass, be understood by all sorts of People to be directed to God alone (which yet you cannot possibly know) yet this I hope hinders not, but that in Processions, you may Incense the Images of the Saints, and consequently (according to your Doctrine) do this Honour to the Saints themselves represented by the Images. I my self (unless I am very much mistaken) was present when this very thing was done to the Picture of Saint *Benet* or Saint *Gregory* in the Cloyster of Saint *Vedastus* in the Monastery in *Doway*.

But indeed what a ridiculous inconsequence is it, to think that Wax Tapers may lawfully be offered to the Saints and incense may not: or if Incense may not, which you seem to disclaim as impious, that Wax Tapers may.

4. *Demand.* Whether the *Collyridians* were not condemned as Hereticks by the Ancient Church. First, for offering a Cake upon a Anniversary Feast to the Blessed Virgin. Secondly for that they did this not being Priests.

Answ. The *Collyridians* were condemned as Hereticks for two things. First, for imploying Women in the place and Office of Priests to offer a Cake (not in the nature of a gift or present,) but in the nature of a [a] Sacrifice, which was never lawful for any but [b] men, and those [c] consecrated.

[a] *Ut in nomen Virginis Collyridem quandam Sacrificarent.* Epiph. hær. 78. *Offerunt panem in nomen* Mariæ, *omnes autem pane participant* — [b] *Deo enim ab æterno nulla tenus mulier Sacrificavit.* Idem hæres. 79. [c] *Diaconissarum ordo est in Ecclesia, sed non ad Sacrificandum, nam neque Diaconis concreditum est, ut aliquod mysterium perficiant.* Id. Ibid.

Secondly, for offering this [a] Sacrifice εἰς ὄνομα in the name of the Blessed Virgin, *i. e.* unto her, her self directly and terminatively, as an act of [b] Divine Worship and ado-

[a] *vid. sup. littera* (a)
[b] *Mortuis cultum divinum*

adoration, due unto her, as unto a Sovereign [c] Power and Deity. *præstantes.* Id. Ibid. *And again: Revera virgo erat honorata, sed non ad adorationem nobis data. sed ipsa adorans Deum.* And again: *Non ut adoretur Virgo, nec ut Deum hanc efficeret,* &c. *Sit in honore* Mariæ; *Pater & Filius & Spiritus S. adoretur, Mariam nemo adoret. Deo debetur hoc mysterium* Id. Ibid.

[c] *Pro Deo hanc introducere statuerant.* Id. Ibid. *Revera Sanctum erat* Mariæ *corpus non tamen Deus.* And again. *Mulierem eam appellavit* Joh. 2. *Velut prophetans: & ne aliqui nimium admirati Sanctum, in hanc hæresin dilabantur.* And again. *Non tamen aliter genita est præter hominis naturam, sed sicut omnes ex semine viri & utero Mulieris.* Id. Ibid.

Reply. It seems then these Women might offer this Cake to the honour and name of the Virgin *Mary,* if they had done it as a *Gift* or *Present* and not as a *Sacrifice. Epiphanius* then surely was too hasty to condemn them, being informed of nothing, but that they offered a Cake unto her. Methinks before he had put them in his Catalogue, he should have enquired whether they offered this Cake as a *Gift* only, or as a *Sacrifice.* Certainly had the practice of offering to Saints by way of gifts, been the practice of the Church in his time, he would not have been so uncharitable, as to condemn that action as impious and Heretical, which might have received so lawful and pious a construction. But he, good man, it seems could not conceive a difference between a Sacrifice, and the offering a Creature by way of Consumption to the Honour of that to which it is offered. The subtle Wits of our times I hope have found out another definition for it, and I shall understand by you what it is. But if you can find no other, then certainly, though setting up a Picture or hanging up a Leg or Eye or Ear in memory of some miraculous cure, obtained by a Saints intercession, would be a *Gift* or *Present* only; yet offering of Incense, or burning a Taper in the honour of a Saint, daub the matter how you will, will be without Question a *Sacrifice.* If you say, that there may be such an offering and yet no Sacrifice; I would know then, how you would prove that the *Collyridians* offering was indeed a Sacrifice? All that *Epiphanius* says of them is but this —— *Panem proponunt & in Mariæ nomen offerunt.* And though this

this offering of theirs was indeed a Sacrifice in the notion of the word which I have given it, yet doth he not any where say expresly, *That they did Sacrifice, or offer it as a Sacrifice,* but only and barely that they did *offer it* : not using (as good fortune would have it) any word which doth of necessity and properly signifie *to Sacrifice* : and therefore you are fain to help the Dice, and alter every place for your advantage. *Epiphanius* says not, as you translate him, *ut in nomen Virginis Collyridem quendam Sacrificent*; nor *Sacrificantes offerunt*, as *Petavius :* but ὡς ἐπιτελεῖν, which may as well signifie, to *consecrate* or *offer*, as to *Sacrifice,* if there be any difference between them. So the next place, *offerunt panem in nomen Mariæ, omnes autem pane participant* ; proves not I hope offering by way of *Sacrifice,* unless the Consumption of the oblation make it a *Sacrifice* ; which if it do, how your Tapers can be kept from being Sacrifices I cannot imagine; unless again perhaps Consumption by way of *Eating* will make it a *Sacrifice,* and by *Burning* will not; which cannot be, because the whole Burnt-offerings were Sacrifices as well as any other.

Your third place is, *Deo autem ab æterno nullatenus mulier Sacrificavit.* But ἱερατεύω signifies not *to Sacrifice,* but only to *perform the Office of a Priest,* and so *Petavius* translates the place. *Nunquam sacerdotio functa est mulier.* And though Sacrificing be *one* perhaps, yet will you not say it is the *only* Office of a Priest : as your next and last place would have declared, had you set it down faithfully; but in that also you juggle again, and force it to speak to your purpose thus. *Diaconissarum ordo est in Ecclesia, sed non ad Sacrificandum :* but *Petavius* hath translated it truly thus : *Quanquam vero Diaconissarum in Ecclesia ordo sit, non tamen ad sacerdotii functionem, aut ullam administrationem institutus est.* And now though by an usual Synechdoche the name of the *Genus* be given to the *Species,* and therefore had a man fairly and candidly translated ἱερατεύω by *Sacrifico,* I should not have much condemned him, yet to do it when the Question is, whether this their offering, confessed to be an offering, were in propriety of speech

a Sa-

a Sacrifice, to do it for Ends, to ſhift off a convincing argument, to palliate over a foul matter, by putting a verbal difference where there is none indeed, and all that you may, *Imperitos rerum in fraudem illicere*; that is —— But I forbear you.

But Secondly it is pretended, [*they offered this Sacrifice* εἰς ὄνομα *in the name of the Bleſſed Virgin:* i. e. *unto her, her ſelf, directly and terminately as an act of Divine Worſhip and adoration due unto her, as unto a Sovereign Power and Deity.*] And to colour and countenance this ſtrange gloſs, many places are quoted out of *Epiphanius*, which I will examine in order as they lie.

The firſt place is, *mortuis cultum Divinum præſtantes*, where your meaning is, I believe, that *Epiphanius* ſays the *Collyridians* did ſo: but the truth is he ſays only, *mortuos colentes*; as *Petavius* tranſlates it: and therefore here once again you help the Dice; yet if he had ſaid ſo, why ſhould you rather from *cultum divinum* collect that, that they thought her *God*, than from *mortuis*, that they thought her *Dead*, and therefore certainly not a God? Certainly this can be no warrant to you, that *Epiphanius* charges them with ſo thinking: For *Proteſtants* you know impute to *Papiſts* that they give to Saints *cultum divinum*, and yet they do not impute to them the Hereſie of thinking, that the Saints are Sovereign Powers and Deities: But as S. *Paul* accuſeth the Gentiles, for that knowing God to be God, *they did not worſhip him as God*, ſo on the other ſide, *Proteſtants* condemn *Papiſts*, and *Epiphanius* for ought we can ſee hitherto, might condemn the *Collyridians*, for that knowing the Bleſſed Virgin not to be God, they yet worſhip'd her as God. That is, gave her that worſhip which is Gods own peculiar, which yet they might do, not becauſe they thought her God, but becauſe this worſhip, which was indeed proper to God, they might think not proper, but communicable to ſuch Creatures as were high in his favour.

The next place is —— *Revera virgo erat honorata, ſed non ad adorationem nobis data, ſed ipſa adorans Deum*, &c.

I anſwer that the *&c.* perhaps conceals ſomething more pertinent to your purpoſe, but in the Words ſet down there appears to me juſt nothing; for I can frame out of them no other Syllogiſm but this.

Whatſoever *Epiphanius* in this place ſays is not to be adored, that the *Collyridians* thought to be God.

But *Epiphan.* here ſays the Virgin is not to be adored.

Ergo. The *Collyridians* thought her God.

Of this Syllogiſm I deny the Major propoſition, and I believe ſhall ſtay as long for a proof of it, as I have done for an anſwer to ſome other diſcourſes, which being written in a few days, have waited now with a longing expectation for a promiſed anſwer many months. If you ſay, you would conclude from theſe Words, that they did adore her and therefore thought her God, I have anſwered already, that they might do this, not becauſe they thought her God, but becauſe they thought Creatures high in Gods favour capable of adoration.

The next place —— *Non ut adoretur Virgo, nec ut deum hanc efficeret* — tells us that Chriſt took Fleſh of the Virgin, not that ſhe ſhould be adored, nor to make her God: And this you think imports, that they conceive her God. Yet if I ſhould, condemning your Practice of offering Tapers to her, uſe the ſame Words and ſay, — *Chriſt took Fleſh of the Virgin, not that ſhe ſhould be adored, or to make her God:* You would not yet conceive that I charged you with the Hereſie of believing her God, but only of the impiety of giving to her that worſhip which was peculiar to God: and why then might not *Epiphanius,* having like occaſion, uſe the ſame words to the *Collyridians* upon the ſame, and no other ground.

The next place —— *Mariam nemo adoret, Deo debetur hoc myſterium,* — is ſo far from proving your imagination, that it ſtrongly confirms my aſſertion, that *Epiphanius* did not impute to the *Collyridians* the opinion, *that the Virgin* Mary *was God.* If I ſhould ſay to a *Papiſt,* the Bleſſed Virgin is not to be worſhiped with the worſhip of *Hyperdaulia,* becauſe ſuch worſhip is due only to the Mother of God, would they not ſay I were mad and argued againſt my

my ſelf, for that they believed ſhe was the Mother of God. By like reaſon, if *Epiphanius* knew, that the *Collyridians* believed the Virgin *Mary* to be God, he reaſoned as wildly againſt himſelf in ſaying —— *Mariam nemo adoret, Deo debetur hoc myſterium* —— For it is very true (might they have ſaid) this ſervice is due to God alone, but you know our Belief and Profeſſion that ſhe is God, and therefore by your own rule capable of this worſhip.

The next place is —— *Pro Deo hanc introducere ſtuduerunt.* And may not this be juſtly ſaid to any man, who to any thing beſides God, gives that worſhip which is proper and peculiar unto God? What if to man that ſhould teach — · *The* Pope *had power to diſpenſe with men for the keeping of Gods Laws* —— I ſhould ſay, *pro Deo Papam introducis.* Muſt I of neceſſity mean that that man did verily believe the *Pope* not a man but a Sovereign Power and Deity? S. *Paul* tells us that *Covetouſneſs is Idolatry*; he tells us of ſome, *whoſe God is their Belly*; is it therefore conſequent, that every covetous man doth indeed believe his *Gold*, and every Glutton his *Belly*, to be indeed a Sovereign Power and Deity? Away with ſuch fopperies. Whoſoever loves, or fears, or truſts in any thing more than God, may yet be juſtly ſaid to make that his God, and whoſoever ſhould worſhip any Creature with that external worſhip which God has appropriated to himſelf, might juſtly be ſaid to bring in that Creature for God. S. *Paul* tells us of ſome, who *in words profeſſed God*, yet *factis negabant, in their deeds deny him*: ſo theſe on the contrary, may in their words deny this Creature to be God, and in their Hearts not think it ſo, yet ſeeing their actions to it are as if it were God, they may be juſtly charged, that with their deeds they make this Creature God.

Qui fingit Sacros ex auro & marmore vultus,
Non facit ille Deos, qui colit ille facit.

What if upon conſideration of the ſtrangely enormous worſhip which *Papiſts* give to the Virgin *Mary* (ſwearing by her name, making Vows unto her, offering Tapers to her Honour, attributing a kind of Communica-

ted omniſcience and almoſt omnipotence to her, as I can eaſily make good they do, partly out of the Offices of their Church, partly out of private mens Works, but ſet out with Licence and approbation) what I ſay, if upon this conſideration I ſhould affirm, *pro Deo ipſam introducere conantur.* Would it therefore be conſequent, that I muſt impute this Blaſphemy to them, that they believed and taught her to be a Sovereign Power and Deity? I trow not. And therefore *Epiphanius* might ſay the ſame of the *Collyridians* conſidering their *Action*, without any intent of imputing to them any ſuch *opinion.* This *Petavius* ſure ſaw well enough, and therefore (as I ſhall hereafter demonſtrate to the Eye) to countenance his Marginal Annotation, *Quidam Mariam Deum eſſe crediderunt*, he cunningly abuſes and perverts *Epiphanius* his Text with falſe Tranſlation. —— *Sic pugnat, Sic eſt metuendus Ulyſſes.* —— The next place is, *revera ſanctum erat* Mariæ *corpus non tamen Deus.* (*The Body of* Mary *was truly holy, but not a God.*) As much to the purpoſe as — *Tityre tu patulæ* —— for what if *Epiphanius* ſay, ſhe is not God, and therefore not to be adored, does it therefore follow that the *Collyridians* believed ſhe was a God? He that knows Logick or ſenſe, cannot but know, that he that will confute an Adverſaries concluſion, muſt chooſe ſuch principles to do it, to which his Adverſary conſents, and out of that which he grants prove that which he denies; or if his firſt propoſitions be not agreed to by his Adverſary, he muſt prove them in the end by ſuch as are agreed to; or elſe he does nothing. And therefore ſeeing *Epiphanius* thinks it ſufficient for the convincing of the *Collyridians*, of the unlawfulneſs of the practice, to ſay, ſhe was not God: it is evident, that ſo far was he from imputing to them the belief that ſhe was God, that he ſeems rather to take the contrary for a principle agreed upon between them, which it was ſufficient to ſay and ſuperfluous to prove. This anſwer I thought good to make, while I conceived that here *Epiphanius* had denied the Perſon of the Virgin *Mary* to be God; but after upon better conſideration I found that *Petavius* had abuſed me with adding to *Epiphanius*

phanius of his own —— *Illa fuit* —— and that *Epiphanius* ſays not here, *non tamen Deus* (*ſhe was not God*) of her *Perſon*, but of her *Body*; and as yet I do not underſtand that you impute to the *Collyridians* the belief, that her Body was God.

The next place —— *Mulierem eam appellavit*, &c. —— ſays no more but this; that our Saviour calls the Bleſſed Virgin *Woman*, that no man might think her any thing more than a Woman, as it were prophetically refuting the Schiſms and Hereſies which would be in the World: leſt ſome out of exceſs of admiration of her, might fall into the Dotage of this Hereſie. Thus far *Epiphanius*: but then the Queſtion will be, what was this Hereſie. You ſay the belief that ſhe was God. I ſay, not that ſhe was God, but that they might lawfully offer to her. And as I deny not but it follows, *ſhe is a Woman, therefore not a God*; ſo I think you will grant it follows as juſtly, *ſhe is a Woman, therefore not to be adored with offerings.* And therefore ſeeing the words lie indifferently between us, and are not expreſly and eſpecially here applied, for the refutation of that Hereſie which you pretend they were guilty of, I ſee no reaſon why *Epiphanius* might not as well intend them for that purpoſe which I conceive, as for that which you conceive.

The laſt place alledged tells us, *that ſhe was begotten and Born as other Men and Women are.* Which if the *Collyridians* had thought her God, Eternal and abſolutely without beginning, ſhould not have been barely ſaid but proved, as being in effect the very point in queſtion; and therefore ſeeing *Epiphanius* contents himſelf with ſaying ſo without proof, it is evident he never thought they would make difficulty to grant it, and conſequently that they did not believe her to be God Eternal.

But then again, if the Rule be good which part of your proofs depend upon, That whatever *Epiphanius* denies in this diſcourſe, that the *Collyridians* held (for upon that ground from —— *Non & Deum hanc efficeret: & non tamen Deus*, you conclude they believed her God) If I ſay this Rule be good, then you ſhould be conſtant to it, and

and now that he says, —— *Non tamen aliter genita est præter hominum naturam, (she was not begotten in a different way from other men)* you should infer, that they believed not that she was God, but that she was otherwise Born and Begotten than the ordinary sort of Men. And so whereas he says before —— *Non tamen corpus de cœlo tulit* - —— *(her Body was not from Heaven)* you should infer, that they believed her Body came from Heaven. And again from those —— *Sanctum erat Mariæ corpus non tamen Deus* —— you should collect that they thought not only her person, but her Body to be God: or if these be wild and weak deductions, then you must acknowledge that I have done yours some favour in vouchsafing them a particular answer.

5. *Demand.* Whether in the Church of *Roman,* it be not an approved and perpetually practised worship of the Blessed Virgin, that Incense (which was never anciently offered unto any, either by *Jews* or *Gentiles,* but to the true, or to a supposed true God) and Tapers and divers other oblations, should be offered to her honour?

Answ. A practice of the Church of *Rome,* and approved too by those that practise it, belongs not to her, except it be a practice of the Church and approved by her. What her practice is abroad I know not; here at home I see no such practice; nor do I know any approbation of it, in any of her publick declarations: But this I know, that there is nothing in it unlawful or favouring of the *Collyridian Superstition,* to offer Wax, Tapers or any other thing at the Memories of the Blessed Virgin or any other Canonized Saint, either as means to procure their intercession, by these outward Signs of the Honour and Devotion which they bear to them (as of Old we find by S. *Austin* [a] they did use to adorn their Tombs with Flowers) or as monuments of their thankfulness for some benefits received by their Intercession, as *Theodoret* [b] tells

[a] Ad *aquas Tibilotanas, Episcopo offerente Projecto, reliquias martyris gloriosissimi* Stephani, *ad ejus memoriam veniebat magnæ multitudinis concursus & occursus. Ibi cæca mulier, ut ad episcopum portantem pignora Sacra duceretur, oravit: Flores quos ferebat dedit; recepit, oculis admovit, protenus vidit.* August. de Civit. Dei. l. 22. c. 8. *abscedens aliquid de Altari* (S. Stephani) *florum quod occurrit, tulit.* Idem. Ibid. &c. [b] *Theodoretus de curandis affec:* Græc. l. 8.

us

us of Eyes and Ears and Hands, ſome of Gold and ſome of Silver (hung up in the Chappels of the Saints) that had been preſented as oblations by thoſe that had recovered health in thoſe Members, according to their Vows made to that purpoſe in time of Sickneſs.

Reply. I do not deny, but a practice may be *tolerated* in a Church, and not *approved.* As the *Publick Stews* are in *Italy*, and *Uſury* in *England*: But it is one thing to Tolerate with condemnation, another to Tolerate without condemnation, nay with condemnation of thoſe that ſhould oppoſe or condemn it. And ſuch I doubt not upon examination, you may find is this practice, general in the Church of *Rome*, offering Tapers to the Saints and for their honour. I ſay, not only to God, at the Memories of the Saints, as you would mince the matter, which yet were a groundleſs ſuperſtition, (God having appointed no ſuch Sacrifice to be offered to him under the Goſpel) but to the Saints themſelves and to their honour, prove this lawful for either of thoſe purpoſes you mention, either to procure their interceſſion or as Monuments of thankfulneſs for benefits obtained by it, and then you ſhall do ſomething. Otherwiſe you will but trifle as now you have done: For inſtead of telling us what may be done *de jure*, you tell us what of Old has been done *de facto.* As if *ab antiquo*, and a *principio* were all one; or as if the Church (as we pretend) being ſubject to corruption, part of this corruption might not poſſibly have come in S. *Auſtins* or *Theodorets* time; yet this I ſay not, as if I would decline the Tryal of this cauſe by S. *Auſtin* or *Theodoret*; but becauſe I am ſure you will not be Tryed by the Fathers, no not the conſent of Fathers in all things: and therefore there is no reaſon nor equity in the World, that you ſhould ſerve your ſelves with their Authority in any thing.

But now what is it, which was done in S. *Auſtins* time, that may juſtifie the Practice of the *Roman* Church? was there then any approved offering of Wax, Tapers and Incenſe, to the Queen of Heaven or any other Saint? *nil horum*: you neither do nor can produce any thing out of S. *Auſtin* to this purpoſe. But what then is it? Why forſooth,

forſooth, they were uſed to adorn their Tombs: *Egregiam verò laudem & ſpolia ampla*; of Old in S. *Auſtins* time they were uſed to adorn their Tombs with Flowers, therefore we may offer Tapers to them. Truly an excellent *Enthymeme*, but I fear the concealed propoſition which ſhould make it a *Syllogiſm*, hides its head for ſhame and dares not appear: yet we will for once make bold to draw it forth into light, that you may look upon it and tell us how you like it. This therefore it is.

Whoſe ſoever Tombs we adorn, to them and to their honour we may offer Wax Tapers.

Conſider it I pray you, and if you approve it, then approve alſo of offering Tapers not only to Canonize Saints, but to all Chriſtians that may have Monuments in Churches. For all their Tombs may be adorned, with more pretious and laſting Ornaments than Flowers; yet if you had proved but this only, that in S. *Auſtins* time, they adorned the Saints Tombs with Flowers by theſe outward ſigns to procure their Interceſſion; this, though not much to the purpoſe, had been not abſolutely to delude us. But your quoted places prove not ſo much as this; and yet I believe you quoted the beſt you could find. Nay they prove not they did adorn their Tombs with Flowers at all, much leſs that they did it for your pretended purpoſe; ſuch fools you think to deal with, that will take any thing for any thing. Your firſt place, I ſay, proves it not, unleſs out of meer courteſie we underſtand by *ferebat, ſhe brought to adorn S.* Stephens *Tomb.*

The Second proves it not, unleſs we give you leave after *Altari* (without warrant from S. *Auſtin*) to put in, S. *Stephani*, whereas I am yet to ſeek for any place in S. *Auſtin*, where he calls any Altar, the Altar of ſuch or ſuch a Saint, which yet I think they forbore not for the unlawfulneſs, but for fear of miſconſtruction.

Then for *Theodoret*, he tells us indeed of Vows made, of monuments of thankfulneſs dedicated, for benefits obtained by the interceſſion of the Martyrs. But here alſo I fear your Conſcience tells you, that you abuſe us and hide your ſelf in ambiguities. For to whom does *Theodoret*

ſay

ſay theſe Vows were made? to whom were theſe monuments of thankfulneſs dedicated? What, to the Author? or Procures of the received favours? To God, or to the Martyrs? If to the Martyrs, that had been ſomething towards, though not home to your purpoſe: For there is a a wide difference between offering of a Creature by way of Conſumption (as was never lawfully done but to God alone, as a profeſſion that he is the Lord of the Creature) and erecting a permanent Monument to a Saints honour; which I doubt not but it may lawfully be done to a living Saint, much more to the memory of a Martyr. But *Theodoret* in the place, hath not ſo much as this: Nay it is evident that theſe gifts he ſpeaks of, were both Vowed and payed to God himſelf. His words are —— *Piè precatos ea conſequi*, &c. —— that they which pray piouſly, obtain the things which they deſire, they paying of their Vowed preſents in the ſign of their recovered health, doth abundantly teſtifie. For their Lord accepts moſt gratiouſly theſe preſents how mean ſo ever.

6. *Demand.* Whether according to the Doctrine of the *Roman* Church, this may not be done lawfully by Women and Children, and men that are not Prieſts?

Anſw. They may offer any thing by way of *gifts* and *preſents*, by the Doctrine of the *Roman* Church; But it is contrary to the *Roman* Doctrine, for any other than Prieſts, to offer any thing by way of *Sacrifice*, as the *Collyridians* did.

Reply. Ariſtotle ſays moſt truly, that true Definitions (he means I think of the terms of the concluſion to be demonſtrated) are the beſt principles of Science: and therefore want of them, muſt needs be a cauſe of Error and confuſion in any diſcourſe. Let me therefore here requeſt you to ſet down what is a *Sacrifice*, and how diſtinguiſhed from an oblation by way of *gift* or *preſent*, and you will quickly ſee, that if the *Collyridians* offering a Cake to the Bleſſed Virgin were indeed a *Sacrifice*, your offering a Taper to her, muſt likewiſe be ſo. For a *Sacrifice* is nothing elſe (for ought I know) but the oblation of any Creature by way of *Conſumption*, to the honour

of that, whatſoever it is, to which it is offered. For if you include in the definition, that this offering muſt be intended to the higheſt Lord of all: So is, as you pretend, your offering of Tapers to the Bleſſed Virgin, intended to God finally, though not immediately. If you ſay it muſt be directed immediatly to him; and is, not only *no lawful Sacrifice*, but ſimply *no Sacrifice* unleſs it be ſo: I ſay you may as well require to the eſſence of a Sacrifice, that it be offered by a Prieſt, and from thence conclude, becauſe the *Collyridians* were, you ſay, no Prieſts, their offering was no Sacrifice. For the object of the Action is as extrinſecal to the eſſence of it, as the efficient; And therefore if the defect of a due and legitimate Offerer, cannot hinder but that an offering may be a true Sacrifice, neither will the want of a due and lawful object be any hindrance but ſtill it may be ſo. Secondly, I ſay, this is to confound the eſſence of things with the lawful uſe of them; in effect as if you ſhould ſay, that a Knife, if miſimployed, were a Knife no longer. Thirdly, it is to make it not unlawful, to offer Incenſe (which yet you ſeem ſomewhat ſcrupulous of) or Burnt-offerings to the Virgin *Mary*, or the Saints, or even to living Men, provided you know and believe and profeſs them to be Men and not Gods. For this once ſuppoſed, theſe offerings will be no longer Sacrifices, and to offer to Creatures offerings that are not Sacrifices, you ſay, by the Doctrine of the *Roman* Church is lawful: It is laſtly, to deny (which is moſt ridiculous) that the *Pagans* did indeed Sacrifice to any of their inferiour Gods.

7. *Demand.* If it be ſaid, that this worſhip which they give to the Bleſſed Virgin is not that of *Latria*, but that of *Dulia* or *Hyperdulia*, for that they do not eſteem her God: or if it be ſaid, that their worſhip to her is not finally terminated neither, but given her for her relation to Chriſt. I demand, whether as it is, in S. *Pauls* judgment, a great crime for him that knows God, not to worſhip him as God, ſo it be not as great a crime, for him that knows her not to be God, yet to worſhip her (as if ſhe were God) with the worſhip which is proper and

and hath been alwaies appropriated to God alone, ſuch is the *worſhip of oblations*?

Anſw. The *worſhip of oblations*, as *worſhip* is taken largly for *honour*, and *oblations* for a *gift* or *preſent*, was never appropriate to God alone; take *worſhip* and *oblations* in any higher ſenſe, and ſo it is not allowed in the Church of *Rome*.

Reply. The *oblation* of things by way of *Conſumption*, is the worſhip I ſpoke of; this is a higher matter, than that of *gifts* and *preſents*, and this is allowed in the Church of *Rome*, to be imployed on, and directed into, (though not terminated in) the Virgin *Mary* and other Saints.

8. *Demand.* Whether any thing can be ſaid for the juſtifying the Doctrine and practice of the *Roman* Church in this matter, which might not alſo have been as juſtly pretended, for the juſtification of the *Collyridians* in their opinion and practice; ſeeing it was never imputed to them, that they accounted the Bleſſed Virgin God, or that they believed in more Gods than one. And ſeeing their chooſing her out, rather than any other Woman or any other Creature for the object of their Devotion, ſhews plainly, that they gave it her for her Relation to Chriſt?

Anſw. The *Collyridians* could not ſay this, as appears by what has been ſaid before: As it is a moſt ſhameleſs ſlander upon Gods Church, and ſuch as (without repentance) will lie heavy upon his Soul that uttered it, that the *Collyridians* might as juſtly and truly have ſaid all this for themſelves as *Papiſts* for themſelves.

Reply. To this I reply four things. 1. That to my laſt and moſt convincing reaſon, you have anſwered (as much as you could I believe, but yet you have anſwered) nothing; and I am well content you ſhould do ſo; for where nothing is to be had, the King himſelf muſt loſe his right. 2. That if I had thought or ſpoke better of the *Collyridians* than they deſerved, yet I cannot ſee how this had been to ſlander the Church of *Rome*. 3. That I did not poſitively affirm, that the *Collyridians* might do ſo, but deſired only it might be inquired into and examined,

whether for the reaſons alledged they might not do ſo. 4. And laſtly, upon a thorow examination of the matter, I do now affirm, what before I did not, that the *Collyridians* for ought appears to the contrary, might juſtly and truly have ſaid for the juſtification of their practice, as much, nay the very ſame things that the *Papiſts* do for theirs. For they might have ſaid, we are Chriſtians and believe the Scripture, and believe there is but one God. We offer not to the Bleſſed Virgin, as believing ſhe is God, but the Mother of God: our worſhip of her is not abſolute but relative, not terminated in her, but given to her for her Sons ſake: And if our practice may be allowed, we are content to call our Oblation, not a Sacrifice, but a preſent: neither is there any reaſon, why it ſhould be called a Sacrifice, more than the Offering and Burning a Taper to the honour of the ſame Virgin. All this the *Collyridians* might have ſaid for themſelves: and therefore I believe, you will have more cauſe to repent you for daubing over impiety with untempered Morter, than I ſhall have for ſlandering the *Roman* Church with a matter of truth.

9. *Demand.* Whether therefore, one of the two muſt not of neceſſity follow: that either the Ancient Church Erred in condemning the Opinion and Practice of the *Collyridians* as Heretical, or elſe that the Church of *Rome* Errs, in approving the ſame opinion, and the ſame practice in effect, which in them was condemned. That is, whether the Church of *Rome* muſt not be Heretical with the *Collyridians*, or elſe the *Collyridians* Catholicks with the Church of *Rome?*

Anſw. It appears by the former anſwers, that neither did the Ancient Church Err, in condemning the opinion and practice of the *Collyridians*, as Heretical, nor doth the Church of *Rome* approve the ſame opinion or the ſame practice.

Reply. The Subſtance of the former anſwers is but this. That the *Papiſts* offer to the Virgin *Mary* and other Saints Wax Tapers by way of *gift* or *preſent*, not of Sacrifice; and to her not as to a God, but as the Mother of God:

God: but that the *Collyridians* offered to her by way of Sacrifice, as to a Sovereign Power and Deity. To this I have replied and proved, that it no way appears, that the *Collyridians* did believe the Bleſſed Virgin to be a Sovereign Power and Deity, or that ſhe was not ſubordinate to God. Then that their offering might be called a *gift*, as well as the *Papiſts*, and the *Papiſts* a *Sacrifice* as well as theirs; both of them being a *Conſumption* of a Creature in honour of the Bleſſed Virgin, and neither of them more than ſo: and therefore either the *Collyridians* muſt ſtand with the Church of *Rome*, or the Church of *Rome* fall with the *Collyridians*. It had been perhaps ſufficient for me, thus to have vindicated my Aſſertion from contrary objections, without taking on my ſelf the burden of proving a Negative: yet to free from all doubt the conformity of the *Roman* Church with the *Collyridians*, in this point, I think it will be neceſſary to ſhew, and that by many very probable Arguments, that *Epiphanius* did not impute to them the pretended Hereſie of *believing* the Virgin *Mary God:* for then that other Evaſion, that their oblation is a Sacrifice and the *Papiſts* is not, together with this pretence will of it ſelf fall to the ground.

Now an opinion may be imputed to a man two ways: either becauſe he holds and maintains it expreſly and formally and in terms: or becauſe it may by a rational deduction be collected from ſome other opinion which he does hold: In this latter ſenſe I deny not but *Epiphanius* might impute this opinion we ſpeak of to the *Collyridians*, as a conſequence upon their practice, which practice they eſteemed lawful. But that they held it and owned it formally and in terms, this I ſay *Epiphanius* does not impute to them, which I think for theſe ſeven reaſons.

My firſt Reaſon is, becauſe he could not juſtly do ſo, and therefore without evident proof we may not ſay he did ſo: for this were to be uncharitable to him, in making him uncharitable to others. Now I ſay he could not juſtly charge them with this opinion, becauſe he was not informed of any ſuch opinion that they held, but only of their

their practice, and this practice was no ſufficient proof that they held this opinion. That his information reached no further than their Practice, appears out of his own Words. *I have heard* (ſaith he. Hæreſ. 78.) *another thing with great aſtoniſhment : that ſome being madly affected to the Bleſſed Virgin, endeavour to bring her in in Gods place, being mad and beſides themſelves : For they report that certain Women in* Arabia *have deviſed this Vanity, to have meetings, and offer a Cake to the Bleſſed Virgin :* The ſame practice he ſets down *Hæreſ.* 79. But that he was informed of any ſuch opinion that they held, he has not a Word or Syllable to any ſuch purpoſe; and yet if he had been informed of any, here had been the place to ſet it down : which certainly writing his Book rather of Heretical opinions than practices, he would not have omitted to do ; if there had been occaſion : his ſilence therefore is a ſufficient Argument, that he was not informed of any ſuch opinion that they held.

Now that their practice was no aſſurance that they held this opinion, it is manifeſt; becauſe they might ground it not upon this opinion *that ſhe was God,* but upon another as falſe, though not altogether ſo impious, *That the Worſhip of Oblations was not proper to God alone.* And therefore, though *Epiphanius* might think or fear that poſſibly they might ground their practice upon that other impious opinion, and therefore out of abundant caution confute that alſo, as he doth obliquely and in a word, and once only in all his long diſcourſe, by telling them that our Saviour called her *Woman* ; yet he had no ground from their practice to aſſure himſelf, that certainly they did hold ſo. Nay Juſtice and Reaſon and Charity would, that he ſhould incline himſelf to believe, that they grounded their practice upon that other opinion, which had leſs impiety in it, that is, that this worſhip of Oblations, was not proper to God, but communicable to Creatures high in his favour.

My ſecond is, Becauſe if *Epiphanius* had known, that theſe *Collyridians* held the Bleſſed Virgin to be a Supream Power and Deity ; this being a far greater matter than

offering

offering a Cake to her, ſhould in all probability rather have given them their denomination: at leaſt when he ſets down what their Hereſie was, he would have made this part of it, that they did believe ſo: But to the contrary, in his *Anacæphaleoſis*, p. 130. he thus deſcribes them. *They that offer to the name of the Bleſſed Virgin Cakes, who are called* Collyridians. And again, p. 150. *They that offer to the Bleſſed Virgin Cakes who are called* Collyridians: So to the 79th. Hereſie he gives this Title, *Againſt the* Collyridians *who offer to* Mary: So *Hæreſ.* 78, and 79. He ſets down what he heard of them; but no where that they held this opinion of her: I conclude therefore, that he never conceived this opinion to be a part of their Hereſie, and they were no further chargeable with it, than as a probable conſequent upon their practice.

My third is, Becauſe had the *Collyridians* held her God, they would have worſhiped her all the year long, and not only once a year at a Solemn-time, as *Epiphanius* ſays they did.

My fourth is, Becauſe if *Epiphanius* had known that they held her God, he would queſtionleſs have urged them with thoſe Attributes that are given to God in Scripture, as Eternity, Immortallity, Impoſſibility, Omnipotence, *&c.* And ſhewed them, that if they believed the Scripture, they could not think of her any of thoſe things; if they did not, they had no reaſon to think of her any thing more than of an ordinary Woman.

My fifth is, becauſe had their opinion been, that the Bleſſed Virgin was God; a great part of *Epiphanius*'s diſcourſe were plainly ridiculous; both where he ſays only without proof, ſhe was not a God but a Mortal Creature, which to them that held the contrary ſhould not have been ſaid, but proved: But eſpecially where he ſpeaks to this purpoſe (as he does very frequently) that the honour of Oblations was not to be given to Angels or Men, much leſs to Women, but only to God: for what had that been to the *Collyridians*, if they thought her (as is pretended) a Sovereign Power and Deity? to what purpoſe was it for *Epiphanius* to ask, *Quis prophetam*; *What prophet*

prophet ever permitted, that a Man, much leſs a Woman ſhould be adored, though he be yet alive. Nor John *nor* Tecla, *nor any other Saint. For neither ſhall the Old Superſtition have dominion over us, that leaving the Living God, we ſhould Adore his Creatures.* To what end I ſay was all this, if they thought her not a Saint nor Creature, but God himſelf and the Lord of all? How did this Argument touch them? *Ne Angelos quidem* —— *He ſuffers not the very Angels to be adored, how much leſs the Daughter of* Anna? if they thought her not the Daughter of *Anna*, but God Eternal; In vain had it been to ſay to them — *Not to a Woman, no nor to a Man, but to God alone, is this miſtery* (of Oblation) *due.* So that the Angels themſelves are not fit Subjects for ſuch an honour. Or again, *Let the Creature be turned to the Creator: Let ſhame at length compel you to worſhip God alone:* Or laſtly, that ſo often repeated —— *Let* Mary *be honoured, but the Lord only adored.* For they might have anſwered all this in a word, ſaying, All this diſcourſe ſits beſides the Cuſhion, and concerns us and our offering nothing at all. For we believe the Bleſſed Virgin to whom we offer neither Man nor Woman, nor Angel, nor Creature, but a Deity.

A Sixth Reaſon let it be this, If *Epiphanius* did indeed ſay of the *Collyridians* as is pretended, That they held the Virgin *Mary* God, and ſo difference their practice from the *Papiſts*: Then the Author of this Anſwer and *Petavius* in his Tranſlation, needed not to have dictated to him what he ſhould ſay, nor make him ſay ſo whether he will or no: But it is evident they do ſo, as of the Author of this Anſwer I have already ſhewn: and for *Petavius* his part, I will ſo preſent it to your view, that if you will not ſhut your Eyes, you ſhall not chooſe but ſee it.

Firſt then, *Hæreſ.* 78. *propè fin.* he (*Petavius*) ſets in his Margent, *quidam Deum Mariam eſſe, crediderunt*; and to countenance this with a *loquuntur* of his own putting in, makes them *ſpeak* of her like mad Men, *i. e.* they ſaid ſhe was God: whereas in *Epiphanius*'s Greek they ſay juſt nothing.

Secondly,

Secondly, To faſten the pretended Opinion on them, he tranſlates καινοφώνημα *Novum dogma:* preſuming it ſeems καινοφώνημα would eaſily be miſtaken for καινοφώνημα, and therefore meanes nothing by it, but a vanity or folly.

Thirdly, He tranſlates τοῦτο, *Illud*; and ſo makes it look backward to that pretended *Novum dogma* of the *Collyridians*; whereas it ſignifies there [And] and looks forward to their practice.

Fourthly, With the help of a *Colon*, he ſtops the ſenſe at *Commentas fuiſſe*, whereas in *Epiphanius* there is but a *Comma*, and the ſenſe goes on without ſuſpenſion.

Fifthly, With an *adeo ut*, he brings in their action, as an effect of their former opinion; whereas *Epiphanius* lays nothing to their charge but their Action only: So that whereas *Epiphanius* his words truly tranſlated run thus: *Another thing I have received with great aſtoniſhment, that others being mad concerning the Bleſſed Virgin, have and do go about to bring her in, in the place of God, being mad, I ſay, and beſides themſelves: For they report that certain Women in* Arabia *have brought this vanity of offering a Cake to her name. Petavius* makes them thus —— *Not without admiration we have heard another thing, that ſome in theſe things that concern the moſt holy Virgin have proceeded to that degree of madneſs, that they would obtrude her upon us for a God, and ſpeak of her as madmen: For they report that certain Women in* Arabia, *have invented that new Opinion: ſo that to the Virgins name and honour, they offer by way of ſacrifice a Cake or wreath of Bread.*

Again in the ſame *Hæreſ.* ἱερουργεῖν διὰ γυναικῶν, he tranſlates advantageouſly —— *per mulieres ſacrificia facere.* Whereas ἱερουργεῖν is more general than *ſacrificia facere*, and ſignifies *ſacris operari*, or *ſacros ritus peragere.*

Again, in the ſame place, whereas *Epiphanius* ſays ſimply and abſolutely —— *Let no man offer to her name*, he makes it, *Let no man offer ſacrifice to her name*; as if you might lawfully offer any thing provided you do not call it a ſacrifice.

So again *Hæreſ.*79. beſides his putting cunningly——*ipſa fuit*——which before we took notice of; he makes no ſcruple to put in *Dogma* and *Sacrificium*, whereſoever it may be for his purpoſe. *Epiphanius* his title to this Hereſie is, *Againſt the* Collyridians *who offer to* Mary——*Petavius* puts in——*Sacrifice.*

Again in the ſame page, before *D.* he puts in his own *illo dogmate*, and whereas *Epiphanius* ſays–*in all this*, he makes it, *in all this Opinion.*

Pag.1061. τὸ θηλυϛῆς ὑποψιᾶς, he tranſlates, *this womaniſh Opinion*, whereas ὑπόψια though perhaps it may ſignifie a *thought*, or act of thinking, yet I believe it never ſignifies an *Opinion* which we hold.

Ibid. at *B.* τοῦτο——this——he renders *this Opinion.*

Pag.1064. at *C. Nor that we ſhould offer to her name*, ſimply and abſolutely: he makes it,——*Nor that we ſhould offer ſacrifice to her name.* So many times is he fain to corrupt, and tranſlate him partially, leſt in condemning the *Collyridians*, he might ſeem to have involved the practice of the *Roman Church* in the ſame Condemnation.

My Seventh and laſt Reaſon is this. Had *Epiphanius* known that the *Collyridians* held the *Virgin Mary* to be a Sovereign power and Deity, then he could not have doubted, whether this their offering was to her or to God for her: whereof yet he ſeems doubtful and not fully reſolved, as his own words intimate, *Hæreſ.*79. *ad fin. Quam multa* &c. *How many things may be objected againſt this Hereſie? for idle Women either worſhipping the Bleſſed Virgin, offer unto her a Cake, or elſe they take upon them to offer for her this foreſaid ridiculous oblation. Now both are fooliſh and from the Devil.*

Theſe Arguments I ſuppoſe do abundantly demonſtrate to any man not viel'd with prejudice, that *Epiphanius* imputed not to the *Collyridians* the Hereſie of believing the Virgin *Mary* God: and if they did not think her God, there is then no reaſon imaginable why their oblation of a *Cake*, ſhould not be thought a *Preſent*, as well as the Papiſts

Papiſts offering a *Taper*, or that the Papiſts offering a *Taper*, ſhould not be thought a *Sacrifice*, as well as their offering a *Cake*; and ſeeing this was the difference pretended between them, this being vaniſhed there remains none at all; So that my firſt Concluſion ſtands yet firm; that either the Ancient Church erred in condemning the *Collyridians*, or the preſent errs in approving and practiſing the ſame worſhip.

An Advertisement.

The Reader when he meets with the Phraſe *Catholick Doctrin*, in the two following Diſcourſes, muſt remember, that it does not ſignifie *Articles of Faith* determined in any General Councils, which might be looked upon as the Faith of the whole Church; but the *Current* and *Common Opinion* of the Age, which obtained in it without any known oppoſition and contradiction. Neither need this be wondred at, ſince they are about matters far removed from the Common Faith of Chriſtians, and having no neceſſary influence upon good life and manners, whatſoever neceſſity, by miſtake of ſome Scriptures, might be put upon them.

IV. *An Argument drawn from the admitting Infants to the Euchariſt, as without which they could not be ſaved, againſt the Churches Infallibility.*

THE Condition without the performance whereof no man can be admitted to the Communion of the Church of *Rome*, is this; that he believe firmly and without doubting, whatſoever the Church requires him to believe: More diſtinctly and particularly thus:

He muſt believe all that to be divine Revelation which that Church teaches to be ſuch; as the Doctrin of the Trinity, the Hypoſtatical union of two natures in the perſon of Chriſt. The proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt from the Father and the Son: the Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation, and ſuch like.

Whatſoever that Church teaches to be neceſſary, he muſt believe to be neceſſary. As Baptiſm for Infants; Faith in Chriſt, for thoſe that are Capable of Faith; Penance for thoſe that have committed mortal ſin after Baptiſm, &c.

Whatſoever that Church declares expedient and profitable, he muſt believe to be expedient and profitable: as Monaſtical Life: Prayer to Saints: Prayer for the Dead: going on Pilgrimages: The uſe of Pardons: Veneration of holy Images and Reliques: Latin Service where the people underſtand it not: Communicating the Laity in one kind and ſuch like.

Whatſoever that Church holdeth lawful, he muſt believe lawful: As to Marry: to make diſtinction of Meats, as if ſome were clean and others unclean: to flie in time of Perſecution: for them that ſerve at the Altar, to live by the Altar: to teſtifie a truth by Oath, when a lawful Magiſtrate ſhall require it: to poſſeſs Riches, &c.

Now is it impoſſible that any man ſhould certainly believe any thing; unleſs either it be evident of it ſelf, or he have ſome certain reaſon (at leaſt ſome ſuppoſed certain reaſon) and infallible ground for his belief. Now the Doctrins

Doctrins which the Church of *Rome* teacheth, it is evident and undeniable that they are not evident of themſelves, neither evidently true nor evidently credible. He therefore that will believe them, muſt of neceſſity have ſome certain and infallible ground whereon to build his belief of them.

There is no other ground for a Mans belief of them, eſpecially in many points, but only an aſſurance of the Infallibility of the Church of *Rome*. No man can be aſſured that that Church is infallible and cannot err, whereof he may be aſſured that ſhe hath erred, unleſs ſhe had ſome new promiſe of divine aſſiſtance, which might for the future ſecure her from danger of erring; but the Church of *Rome* pretends to none ſuch.

Nothing is more certain, than that that Church hath erred, which hath believed and taught irreconcileable Contradictions, one whereof muſt of neceſſity be an Error.

That the Receiving the Sacrament of the Euchariſt is neceſſary for Infants, and that the receiving thereof is not neceſſary for them: That it is the will of God, that the Church ſhould adminiſter the Sacrament to them; and that it is not the will of God that the Church ſhould do ſo; are manifeſt and irreconcileable Contradictions: Suppoſing only, (that which is moſt evident) that the Euchariſt is the ſame thing, of the ſame vertue and efficacy now, as it was in the primitive Church: That Infants are the ſame things they were, have as much need, are capable of as much benefit by the Euchariſt, now as then: As ſubject to irreverent carriages, then as now. And laſtly, that the preſent Church is as much bound to provide for the ſpiritual good of Infants, as the Ancient Church was: I ſay theſe things ſuppoſed, the propoſitions before ſet down are plain and irreconcileable Contradictions: whereof the preſent *Roman* Church doth hold the Negative, and the Ancient Church of *Rome* did hold the Affirmative; and therefore it is evident, that either the preſent Church doth err, in holding ſomething not neceſſary, which is ſo; or that the Ancient Church did err, in holding ſomething neceſſary, which was not ſo. For

For the Negative Propoſition, *viz. That the Euchariſt is not neceſſary for Infants*; that it is the Doctrin of the preſent Church of *Rome* it is moſt manifeſt. 1. From the diſuſe and abolition and prohibition of the contrary Ancient practice. For if the Church did conceive it neceſſary for them, either ſimply for their ſalvation, or elſe for their increaſe or confirmation in grace, and advancement to a higher degree of glory (unleſs ſhe could ſupply ſome other way their damage in this thing, which evidently ſhe cannot) what an uncharitable ſacriledge is it, to debar and defraud them of the neceſſary means of their ſo great ſpiritual benefit? eſpecially ſeeing the adminiſtration of it might be ſo ordered, that irreverent caſualties might eaſily be prevented: which yet ſhould they fall out againſt the Churches and Paſtors intention, certainly could not offend God, and in reaſon ſhould not offend man. Or if the Church do believe, that upon ſuch a vain fear of irreverence (which we ſee moved not the Ancient Church at all) ſhe may lawfully forbid ſuch a general, perpetual and neceſſary charity, certainly herein ſhe commits a far greater error than the former. Secondly, from the Council of *Trents* Anathema, denounced on all that hold the contrary, in theſe words. *If any man ſay that the receiving of the Euchariſt, is neceſſary for little children, before they come to years of diſcretion, let him be Anathema.* Concil. Trid. Seſſ. 21. *de communione parvulorum,* Can. 4.

Now for the Affirmative part of the Contradiction, to make it evident that that was the Doctrin of the Ancient Church; I will prove it, Firſt, from the general practice of the Ancient Church for ſeveral Ages. Secondly, by the direct and formal Teſtimonies of the Fathers of thoſe times. Thirdly, by the confeſſion of the moſt learned Antiquaries of the *Roman* Church. My Firſt Argument I form thus. If to communicate Infants was the general practice of the Ancient Church for many Ages; then certainly the Church then believed, that the Euchariſt was neceſſary for them, and very available for their Spiritual benefit: But it is certain, that the Communicating of Infants was the general practice of the Church for many

Ages

Ages: Therefore the Church of thoſe times thought it neceſſary for them. To deny the conſequence of the propoſition, is to charge the Church with extream folly, wilful ſuperſtition, and perpetual profanation of the Bleſſed Sacrament. As for the Aſſumption, it is fully confirmed by *Clemens Rom. Conſtit. Apoſt.* l. 3. c. 20. *Dionyſius Areopagita de Eccleſ. Hierarch.* cap. ult. S. *Cyprian* and a Council of *African* Biſhops with him, *Epiſt.* 59. *ad Fidum*; and in his Treatiſe *de Lapſis* p. 137. Edit. *Pamel. Paulinus* Biſhop of *Nola* in *Italy*, An. 353. in *Epiſt.* 12. *ad Senem*; out of *Ordo Romanus*, cited by *Alevinus* S. *Bedes* Scholar and Maſter to *Charlemain* in his Book *de divinis officiis cap. de Sab. Sancto Paſc. Gennadius Maſſilienſis de Eccleſ. dogmatibus* c. 52. *Concil. Toletanum* 2. Can. 11. It continued in the Weſtern Church, unto the days of *Lewes* the *Debonair*, witneſs *Cardinal Perron des paſſages de S. Auſtin* p. 100. Some footſteps of it remained there in the time of *Hugo de S. Victore*, as you may ſee *lib.* 1. *de Sacram. & Cœrem.* cap. 20. It was the practice of the Church of the *Armenians* in *Waldenſis* his time, as he relates out of *Guido* the *Carmelite*, Tom. 2. de *Sacr.* c. 91. *de erroribus Armenorum.* It is ſtill in force in the Church of the *Abyſſines*, witneſs *Franc. Alvarez. Hiſt. Æthiop.* c. 22. *& Thomas a Jeſu de procuranda ſalute omnium gentium.* It has cotinued without any interruption in the *Greek* Church, unto this preſent Age, as may be evidently gathered out of *Lyranus* in c. 6. *John. Arcudius* lib. 1. c. 14. & lib. 3. c. 40. *de concord. Eccleſ. Orient. & Occident. in Sacram. adminiſtratione*; *Card. Perron des paſſages de S. Auſtin.* p. 100. where he alſo aſſures us of the Primitive Church in general, that ſhe gave Infants the Euchariſt as ſoon as they were baptized: and that the cuſtome of giving this Sacrament to little Infants the Church then obſerved: and before p. 21. That in thoſe Ages it was always given to Infants together with Baptiſm. The ſame is likewiſe acknowledged by *Contzen* in *John* 6. *ver.* 54. and by *Thomas a Jeſu de proc. ſalute omnium gentium.* So that this matter of the practice of the Ancient Church is ſufficiently cleared. Seeing therefore the Ancient Church did uſe this Cuſtom, and could have no other ground for it, but

but their belief that this Sacrament was neceſſary for Infants, it follows neceſſarily, that the Church then did believe it neceſſary.

But deductions, though never ſo evident, are ſuperfluous and may be ſet aſide, where there is ſuch abundance of direct and formal Authentical Teſtimonies; whereof ſome ſpeak in *Theſi*, of the neceſſity of the Euchariſt for all men, others in *Hypotheſi*, of the neceſſity of it for Infants.

My Second Argument, from the Teſtimonies of the Fathers of thoſe times I form thus. That Doctrin, in the affirmative whereof the moſt eminent Fathers of the ancient Church agree, and which none of their contemporaries have oppoſed or condemned, ought to be taken for the Catholick Doctrin of the Church of thoſe times.

But the moſt eminent Fathers of the Ancient Church agree in the Affirmation of this Doctrin, that the Euchariſt is neceſſary for Infants; and none of their contemporaries have oppoſed or condemned it. *Ergo*, it ought to be taken for the Catholick Doctrin of the Church of their times. The Major of this Syllogiſm is delivered and fully proved by *Card. Perron*, in his Letter to *Caſaubon* 5. obſ. and is indeed ſo reaſonable a poſtulate, that none but a contentious ſpirit can reject it.

For confirmation of the Minor, I will alledge, firſt, their ſentences, which in Theſi affirm the Euchariſt to be generally neceſſary for all, and therefore for Infants: and then their Suffrages, who in Hypotheſi avouch the neceſſity of it for Infants.

The moſt pregnant Teſtimonies of the firſt rank are theſe: Of *Iræneus* lib. 4. *cont. Hereſ.* c. 34. where he makes our Union to Chriſt by the Euchariſt, the foundation of the hope of our reſurrection, in theſe words. *As the bread of Earth, after the Invocation of God, is now not common bread, but the Euchariſt, conſiſting of two things an earthly and an heavenly: ſo our bodies receiving the Euchariſt, are not now corruptible (for ever) but have hope of reſurrection.* The like he hath, *lib.* 5. *c.* 2. And hence in probability it is, that the *Nicene Council* ſtiled this Sacrament, *Symbolum reſurrectionis*,

ſurrectionis, the pledge of our Reſurrection. And *Ignatius* Ep. ad Eph. *Pharmacum Immortalitatis*, the Medicine of Immortality.

Cyril. Alex. lib. 4. in Joan. *They ſhall never partake, nor ſo much as taſt, the life of holineſs and happineſs, which receive not the Son in the myſtical Benediction. Cyril.* lib. 10. in Joan. c. 13. & lib. 11. c. 27. *This corruptible nature of our body, could not otherwiſe be brought to life and immortality, unleſs this body of natural life were conjoyned unto it.* The very ſame things ſaith *Gregory Nyſſen.* Orat. Catech. c. 37. And that they both ſpeak of our conjunction with Chriſt by the Euchariſt, the Antecedents and Conſequents do fully manifeſt, and it is a thing confeſſed by learned Catholicks.

Cyprian de cœna Domini, and *Tertullian de reſur. carnis*, ſpeak to the ſame purpoſe: But I have not their Books by me, and therefore cannot ſet down their words. S. *Chryſoſtom*, Hom. 47. in Joh on theſe words, *niſi manducaveritis*, has many pregnant and plain ſpeeches to our purpoſe. *As, the words here ſpoken are very terrible: verily, ſaith he, if a man eat not my fleſh, and drink not my blood, he hath no life in him; for whereas they ſaid before, this could not be done, he ſhews it not only not impoſſible, but alſo very neceſſary.* And a little after; *he often iterates his ſpeech concerning the holy myſteries, ſhewing the neceſſity of the thing, and that by all means it muſt be done.* And again, *what means that which he ſays, my fleſh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed; either that this is the true meat that ſaves the ſoul; or to confirm them in the faith of what he had ſpoken, that they ſhould not think he ſpoke Enigmatically, or parabolically, but knew that by all means they muſt eat his body.*

But moſt clear and unanſwerable is that place *lib.* 3. *de Sacerdotio*, where he ſaith, *If a man cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven unleſs he be born again of water and the holy ſpirit; and if he which eats not the fleſh of our Lord and drinks not his blood, is caſt out of eternal life: And all theſe things cannot be done by any other, but only by thoſe holy hands, the hands, I ſay of the Prieſt, how then without their help can any man, either avoid the fire of hell, or obtain the Crowns laid up for us.*

Theophylact. in 6. Joan. *when therefore we hear, that unleſs we eat the fleſh of the Son of man, we cannot have life, we muſt have faith without doubting in the receiving of the divine myſteries, and never inquire how: for the natural man, that is he which followeth humane, that is, natural reaſons, receives not the things which are above nature and ſpiritual; as alſo he underſtands not the ſpiritual meat of the fleſh of our Lord, which they that receive not, ſhall not be partakers of eternal life, as not receiving Jeſus, who is the true life.* S. *Auſtin* de pec. mer. & Remiſ. c. 24. *Very well do the puny Chriſtians call Baptiſm nothing elſe but ſalvation; and the Sacrament of Chriſts Body nothing elſe but Life; from whence ſhould this be, but as I believe from the Ancient and Apoſtolical Tradition, by which this Doctrin is implanted into the Churches of Chriſt, that but by Baptiſm and the participation of the Lords Table, not any man can attain, neither to the Kingdom of God, nor to ſalvation and eternal life.*

Now we are taught by the learned Cardinal; that when the Fathers ſpeak, not as Doctors, but as witneſſes of the Cuſtoms of the Church of their times; and do not ſay, *I believe this ſhould be ſo holden, or ſo underſtood, or ſo obſerved, but that the Church from one end of the earth to the other believes it ſo, or obſerves it ſo*; then we no longer hold what they ſay, for a thing ſaid by them, but as a thing ſaid by the whole Church; and principally when it is in points, whereof they could not be ignorant, either becauſe of the condition of the things, as in matters of fact; or becauſe of the ſufficiency of the perſons: and in this caſe, we argue no more upon their words probably, as we do when they ſpeak in the quality of particular Doctors, but we argue thereupon demonſtratively.

I ſubſume. But S. *Auſtin* the ſufficienteſt perſon which the Church of his time had, ſpeaking of a point, wherein he could not be ignorant; ſays not that I believe the Euchariſt to be neceſſary to ſalvation; but the Churches of Chriſt believe ſo, and have received this doctrin from Apoſtolical Tradition: Therefore I argue upon his words not probably, but demonſtratively, that this was the Catholick doctrin of the Church of his time. And thus much for

for the *Theſis, That the Euchariſt was held generally neceſſary for all.* Now for the *Hypotheſis*; *That the Euchariſt was held neceſſary for Infants in particular.* Witneſſes hereof are S. *Cyprian,* Pope *Innocentius* I. and *Euſebius Emiſſenus,* with S. *Auſtin* together with the Author of the Book intituled *Hypognoſtica.*

Cyprian indeed does not in terms affirm it, but we have a very clear intimation of it in his Epiſtle to *Fidus.* For whereas he and a Council of Biſhops together with him, had ordered, that Infants might be *baptized* and *ſacrificed,* that is, *communicated* before the eighth day, though that were the day appointed for Circumciſion by the old Law. There he ſets down this as the reaſon of their Decree, *that the mercy and grace of God, was to be denied to no man.*

Pope *Innocent* the firſt, (in *Ep. ad Epiſ. Conc. Milev. quæ eſt inter Auguſt.* 93.) concludes againſt the *Pelagians*; that Infants could not attain eternal life without Baptiſm; becauſe without Baptiſm they were uncapable of the Euchariſt, and without the Euchariſt could not have eternal life. His words are, *but that which your Fraternity affirms them to Preach, that Infants without the grace of Baptiſm may have the rewards of eternal life, is certainly moſt fooliſh; for unleſs they eat the fleſh of the Son of man and drink his blood; they ſhall have no life in them.*

Now that this ſenſe which I have given his words, is indeed the true ſenſe of them, and that his judgment upon the point was as I have ſaid; it is acknowledged by *Maldonate* in *Joan.* 6. *v.* 54. by *Binius* upon the Councils *Tom.* 1. p. 624. by *Sanctesius, Repet.* 6. c. 7. and it is affirmed by S. *Auſtin* who was his Contemporary, held correſpondence by Letters with him, and therefore in all probability could not be ignorant of his meaning. I ſay he affirms it, as a matter out of Queſtion, Epiſt. 106. and *Cont. Julian.* lib. 1. c. 4. where he tells that *Pelagius* in denying this, did diſpute *contra ſedis Apoſtolicæ authoritatem*; againſt the authority of the Sea Apoſtolick; and after, *but if they yield to the Sea Apoſtolick, or rather to the Maſter himſelf and Lord of the Apoſtles, who ſays, that they ſhall not have life in them, unleſs they*

eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, which none may do but those that are baptized; then at length they will confess, that Infants not baptized cannot have life.

Now I suppose no man will doubt, but the belief of the Apostolick Sea; was then (as S. *Austin* assures us *l.* 1. *cont. Jul. c.* 4.) the belief of the Church of *Rome*, taking it for a particular Church: and then it will presently follow, that either other Churches do not think themselves bound in conformity of belief with the *Roman* Church, notwithstanding *Irenæus* his——*necesse est ad hanc Ecclesiam, omnem convenire Ecclesiam:* or that this was then the Doctrin of the Catholick Church. For *Eusebius Emissenus* I cannot quote any particular proof out of him: but his belief in this point is acknowledged by *Sanctes.* Repet. 6. c. 7. Likewise for S. *Austin*, the same *Sanctesius* and *Binius*, and *Maldonate*, either not mindful or not regardful of the Anathema of the Council of *Trent*, acknowledge (in the places above quoted) that he was also of the same belief: and indeed he professeth it so plainly and so frequently, that he must be a meer stranger to him that knows it not, and very impudent that denies it. *Eucharistiam infantibus putet necessariam Augustinus*, say also the Divines of *Lovaine*, in their *Index* to their Edition of S. *Austin:* and they refer us in their *Index* only to Tom. 2. pag. 185. that is, to the 106. Epist. (the words whereof I have already quoted to shew the meaning of *Innocentius*) and to Tom. 7. pag. 282. that is, lib. 1. *de pec. Mer. & remis.* c. 20. where his words are; *Let then all doubt be taken away: Let us hear our Lord I say, saying not of the Sacrament of Holy Baptism, but of the Sacrament of his Table (to which none may lawfully come, but he which has been baptized) unless you eat the flesh of the Son and drink his blood, you shall have no life in you; what seek we any further? what can be answered hereunto? What, will any man dare to say, that this appertains not to little Children, and that without the participation of his body and blood, they may have Life?* &c. with much more to the same effect. Which places are indeed so plain and pregnant for that purpose, that I believe they thought it needless to add more: otherwise had they pleased they might

might have furnished their Index with many more referrences to this point; as *de Pec. Mer. & Rem.* l. 1. c. 24. where of Baptism and the Eucharist he tells us, that *Salus & vita eterna sine his frustra promittitur parvulis.* The same he has *Cont.* 2. *Epist. Pelag. ad Bonifacium* l. 1. c. 22. which yet by *Gratian de Consec. D.* 3. *c. Nulli.* and by *Tho. Aquinas p.* 3. *q.* 3. *art.* 9. *ad tertiam* is strangely corrupted and made to say the contrary, and *l.* 4. *c.* 4. the same *Cont. Julian. l.* 1. *c.* 4. and *l.* 3. *c.* 11. & 12. *Cont. Pelag. & Celest.* l. 2. c. 8. *de Prædest. Sanctorum ad Prosp. & Hilar. l.* 1. *cap.* 14. Neither doth he retract or contradict this opinion any where, nor mitigate any one of his sentences touching this matter, in his Book of *Retractations. Sanctesius* indeed tells us, that he seems to have departed from his Opinion, in his works against the *Donatists.* But I would he had shewed some probable reason to make it seem so to others; which seeing he does not, we have reason to take time to believe him. For as touching the place mentioned by *Beda* in 1. *ad Corinth.* 10. as taken out of a Sermon of S. *Austins, ad infantes ad Altare.* Besides that it is very strange S. *Austin* should make a Sermon to Infants; and that there is no such Sermon extant in his works; nor any memory of any such in *Possidius,* S. *Austins* Scholars Catalogue of his works, nor in his Book of *Retractaitons*: setting aside all this, I say First, That it is no way certain that he speaks there of Infants, seeing in propriety of speech (as S. *Austin* himself teacheth us *Ep.* 23) Infants were not *Fideles,* of whom S. *Austin* in that supposed Sermon speaks. Secondly, Admit he does speak of Infants, where he assures us, that in Baptism every faithful man is made partaker of Christs body and blood, and that he shall not be alienated from the benefit of the Bread and Cup, although he depart this life, before he eat of that Bread and drink of that Cup. All this concludes no more, but that the actual participation of the Eucharist, is not a means simply necessary to attain salvation, so that no impossibility shall excuse the failing of it: Whereas all that I aim at is but this, that in the judgment of the Ancient Church, it was believed necessary, in case of possibility; necessary, not

in

in actu, but *in voto Ecclesiæ*: not necessary to salvation simply, but necessary for the increase of grace and glory: And therefore, Lastly, though not necessary by *necessity of means*, for Infants to receive it; yet necessary by *necessity of precepts* for the Church to give it.

The last witness I promised, was the Author of the work against the *Pelagians* called *Hypognostica*, who (*l.* 5. *c.* 5.) ask the *Pelagians*, *Seeing he himself hath said, unless you eat the flesh*, &c. *How dare you promise eternal life to little Children, not regenerate of water and the Holy Ghost; not having eaten his flesh, nor drank his blood.* And a little after, *Behold then, he that is not Baptized, and he that is destitute of the Bread and Cup of life, is separated from the Kingdom of Heaven.*

To the same purpose he speaks *l.* 6. *c.* 6. But it is superfluous to recite his words, for either this is enough or nothing.

The third kind of proof, whereby I undertook to shew the belief of the ancient Church in this point, was the *Confession of the learnedest Writers and best verst in the Church of* Rome. Who, what the Council of *Trent* forbids under Anathema, that any man should say of any ancient Father, are not yet afraid, nor make no scruple, to say it in plain terms of the whole Church for many Ages together, *viz.* That she believed the Eucharist necessary for Infants. So doth *Maldonate* in *Joan.* 6. *Mitto Augustini & Innocentii sententiam (quæ etiam viguit in Ecclesia per sexcentos annos) Eucharistiam etiam Infantibus necessariam.* I *say nothing* says he, of *Austins* and *Innocentius* his opinion, *that the Eucharist was necessary even for Infants, which doctrin flourished in the* Church for 600. years.

The same almost in terms hath *Binius*, in his Notes on the Councils, pag. 624. *Hinc constat Innocentii sententia (quæ sexcentos circiter annos viguit in Ecclesiâ, quam Augustinus sectatus est) Eucharistiam etiam infantibus necessariam fuisse.*

Lastly, That treasury of Antiquity Cardinal *Perron*, though he speaks not so home as the rest do, yet he says enough for my purpose: *des passages de S. August.* c. 10. p. 101.

p. 101. *The Cuſtom of giving the Euchariſt to Infants the Church then obſerved as profitable.* This I ſay is enough for my purpoſe. For what more contradictious, than the Euchariſt being the ſame without alteration to Infants being the ſame without alteration, ſhould then be profitable and now unprofitable: then all things conſidered expedient to be uſed, if not neceſſary, and therefore commanded: And now, though there be no variety in the caſe, all things conſidered not neceſſary, nor expedient, and therefore forbidden.

The Iſſue of all this Diſcourſe, for ought I can ſee, muſt be this: That either both parts of a Contradiction muſt be true, and conſequently nothing can be falſe, ſeeing that which contradicteth truth is not ſo: or elſe, that the Ancient Church did err in believing ſomething expedient which was not ſo; (and if ſo, why may not the preſent Church err, in thinking *Latin* Service, and Communion in one kind expedient:) or that the preſent Church doth err, in thinking ſomething not expedient, which is ſo. And if ſo, why may ſhe not err, in thinking Communicating the Laity in both kinds, and Service in vulgar Languages, not expedient.

V. *An Argument drawn from the Doctrin of the Millenaries, againſt Infallibility.*

THE Doctrin of the *Millenaries* was, *That before the worlds end, Chriſt ſhould reign upon earth for a thouſand years, and that the Saints ſhould live under him in all holineſs and happineſs.* That this Doctrin is by the preſent *Roman* Church held falſe and Heretical, I think no man will deny.

That the ſame Doctrin, was by the Church of the next Age after the Apoſtles held true and Catholick I prove by theſe two Reaſons.

The firſt Reaſon, Whatſoever doctrin is believed and taught by the moſt eminent Fathers of any Age of the Church, and by none of their contemporaries oppoſed or condemned, that is to be eſteemed the Catholick Doctrin of the Church of thoſe times.

But the Doctrin of the *Millenaries* was believed and taught by the eminent Fathers of the Age next after the Apoſtles, and by none of that Age oppoſed or condemned.

Therefore it was the Catholick Doctrin of the Church of thoſe times. The Propoſition of this Syllogiſm is Cardinal *Perrons* rule, (in his Epiſtle to *Caſaubon*, 5. obſerv.) And is indeed one of the main pillars, upon which the great Fabrick of his Anſwer to King *James* doth ſtand, and with which it cannot but fall; and therefore I will ſpend no time in the proof of it.

But the Aſſumption thus I prove.

That Doctrin which was believed and taught by *Papias* Biſhop of *Hierapolis*, the diſciple of the Apoſtles diſciples (according to *Euſebius*) who lived in the times of the Apoſtles, ſaith he, by *Juſtin Martyr*, Doctor of the Church and Martyr: by *Melito* Biſhop of *Sardis*, who had the gift of Propheſie, witneſs *Tert.* and whom *Bellarmine* acknowledgeth a Saint. By S. *Irenæus* Biſhop of *Lyons* and Martyr; and was not oppoſed and condemned by any one Doctor

Doctor of the Church of thoſe times: That Doctrine was believed and taught by the moſt Eminent Fathers of that Age, next to the Apoſtles, and oppoſed by none.

But the former part of the Propoſition is true. *Ergo*, the Latter is alſo true.

The Major of this Syllogiſm and the latter part of the Minor, I ſuppoſe will need no proof, with them that conſider, that theſe here mentioned were equal in number to all the other Eccleſiaſtical Writers of that Age, of whom there is any memory remaining; and in weight and worth infinitely beyond them: they were *Athenagoras, Theophilus Antiochenus, Egeſippus* and *Hippolitus*: of whoſe contradiction to this Doctrine there is not extant, neither in their works, nor in ſtory, any Print or Footſtep: which if they or any of them had oppoſed, it had been impoſſible, conſidering the Eccleſiaſtical Story of their time is Written by the profeſſed Enemies of the Millinaries Doctrine; who could they have found any thing in the monuments of Antiquity to have put in the Ballance againſt *Juſtin Martyr* and *Irenæus*, no doubt would not have buried it in ſilence: which yet they do, neither vouching for their opinion any one of more Antiquity than *Dionyſius Alexandrinus*, who lived, ſaith *Euſebius, noſtra ætate*, [in our Age] but certainly in the latter part of the third Century. For *Tatianus* becauſe an Heretick I reckon not in this number. And if any man ſay that before his fall he wrote many Books; I ſay, it is true; but withal would have it remembred, that he was *Juſtin Martyrs* Scholar, and therefore, in all probability of his Maſters Faith, rather than againſt it, all that is extant of him one way or other is but this in S. *Hierome, de Script. Eccleſ.* Juſtini Martyris *ſectator fuit.*

Now for the other part of the Minor, that the forementioned Fathers did believe and teach this Doctrine. And firſt for *Papias* that he taught it, it is confeſſed by *Euſebius* the Enemy of this Doctrine (*Lib.* 3. *Hiſt. Eccleſ. c.* 33.) in theſe words, —— *Other things beſides the ſame Author* (Papias) *declares, that they came to him as it were by unwritten Tradition, wherein he affirms that after the Reſur-*

rection of all Flesh from the Dead, there shall be a Kingdom of Christ continued and established for a thousand years upon Earth, after a humane and corporeal manner. The same is confessed by S. *Hierome*, another Enemy to this opinion, (*descript. Eccles. S.* 29.) Papias *the Auditor of* John *Bishop of* Hierapolis *is said to have taught the Judaical Tradition of a thousand years, whom* Irenæus *and* Apollinarius *followed.* And in his preface upon the Commentaries of *Victorinus* upon the *Apocalypse*, thus he writes, — *before him* Papias *Bishop of* Hierapolis *and* Nepos *Bishop in the parts of* Egypt *taught as* Victorinus *does touching the Kingdom of the thousand years.*

The same is testified by *Irenæus* (*lib.* 5. *cont. Her. c.* 33.) where having at large set forth this Doctrine, he confirms it by the Authority of *Papias* in these words. Papias *also the Auditor of* John, *the familiar friend of* Policarpus *an Ancient man, hath testified by writing these things in the fourth of his Books, for he hath writtten five.* And concerning *Papias* thus much.

That *Justin Martyr* was of the same belief, it is confessed by *Sixtus Senensis* (*Biblioth. Sæ. l.* 6. *An.* 347.) by *Feverdentius* in his premonition before the five last Chapters of the 5th. Book of *Irenæus.* By *Pamelius* in *Antidoto ad Tertul. parad. paradox.* 14.

That S. *Melito* Bishop of *Sardis* held the same Doctrine is confessed by *Pamelius* in the same place; and thereupon it is that *Gennadius Massilienses* in his Book *de Eccles. dogmatibus*, calls the followers of this opinion *Melitani*; as the same *Pamelius* testifies in his Notes upon that fragment of *Tertullian de Spe fidelium.*

Irenæus his Faith in this point is likewise confessed by *Eusebius*, in the place before quoted in these words. *He* (Papias) *was the Author of the like Error to most of the Writers of the Church, who alledged the Antiquity of the Man for a defence of their side, as to* Irenæus *and whosoever else seemed to be of the same opinion with him.*

By S. *Hierome* in the place above cited *de script. Eccles. S.* 29. Again in *Lib. Ezek.* 11. in these words. *For neither do we expect from Heaven a Golden* Hierusalem (*according to the Jewish tales which they call* Duteroffis) *which also*

ſo many of our own have followed: *Eſpecially* Tertullian *in his Book* de ſpe fidelium ; *and* Lactantius *in his ſeventh Book of Inſtitutions, and the frequent expoſitions of* Victorinus Pictavionenſis : *and of late* Severus *in his Dialogue which he calls* Gallus: *and to name the* Greeks *and to joyn together the firſt and laſt,* Irenæus *and* Apollinarius. Where we ſee he acknowledges *Irenæus* to be of this opinion ; but that he was the firſt that held it, I believe that that is more a Chriſtian untruth than *Irenæus* his opinion a Judaical Fable. For he himſelf acknowledges in the place above cited, that *Irenæus* followed *Papias* ; and it is certain and confeſſed that *Juſtin Martyr* believed it long before him : and *Irenæus* himſelf derives it from —— *Preſbyteri qui* Johannem *diſcipulum Domini viderunt* ; from Prieſts which ſaw *John* the Diſciple of the Lord. Laſtly, by *Pamelius, Sixtus Senenſis,* and *Faverdentius* in the places above quoted.

Seeing therefore it is certain, even to the confeſſion of the Adverſaries, that *Papias, Juſtin Martyr, Meleto* and *Irenæus,* the moſt conſiderable and eminent men of their Age, did believe and teach this Doctrine ; and ſeeing it has been proved as evidently as a thing of this nature can be, that none of their contemporaries oppoſed or condemned it ; It remains according to Cardinal *Perrons* firſt rule ; that this is to be eſteemed the Doctrine of the Church of that Age.

My ſecond Reaſon I form thus. Whatſoever Doctrine is taught by the Fathers of any Age, not as Doctors but as witneſſes of the Tradition of the Church, (that is, not as their own opinion, but as the Doctrine of the Church of their times) that is undoubtedly to be ſo eſteemed ; eſpecially if none contradicted them in it. But the Fathers above cited teach this Doctrine, not as their own private opinion, but as the Chriſtian Tradition, and as the Doctrine of the Church, neither did any contradict them in it. *Ergo,* it is undoubtedly to be ſo eſteemed.

The Major of this Syllogiſm, is Cardinal *Perrons* ſecond Rule and way of finding out the Doctrine of the Ancient Church in any Age : and if it be not a ſure Rule, farewel the uſe of all Antiquity.

And for the *Minor*, there will be little doubt of it, to him that considers, that *Papias* professes himself to have received this Doctrine by unwritten Tradition, though not from the Apostles themselves immediately, yet from their Scholars, as appears by *Eusebius* in the forecited third Book 33. Chapter.

That *Irenæus* grounding it upon evident Scripture, professes that he learnt it, (whether mediately or immediately I cannot tell) from (*a*) *Presbyteri qui* Johannem *Discipulum Domini viderunt*. Priests or Elders who saw *John* the Lords Disciple, and heard of him what our Lord taught of those times (of the thousand years) and also, as he says after, from *Papias* the Auditor of *John* the Chamberfellow of *Polycarpus*, an Ancient man who recorded it in writing.

(*a*) *Faverdentius* his Note upon this place is very Notable. *Hinc apparet* (saith he) from hence it appears that *Irenæus* neither first invented this opinion, nor held it as proper to himself, but got this blot and blemish from certain Fathers. *Papias* I suppose and some other inglorious fellows, the familiar Friends of *Irenæus*, are here intended.

I hope then if the Fathers which lived with the Apostles had their blots and blemishes; it is no such horrid Crime for *Calvin* and the *Century writers* to impute the same to their great Grandchildren. *Ætas parentum pejor avis progeniem fert vitiosiorem.* But yet these inglorious Disciples of the Apostles, though perhaps not so learned as *Faverdentius*, were yet certainly so honest, as not to invent lies and deliver them as Apostolick Tradition; or if they were not, what confidence can we place in any other unwritten Tradition.

Lastly, that *Justin Martyr* grounds it upon plain Prophecies of the *Old Testament*, and expres words of the *New*: he professeth, *That he, and all other Christians of a right belief in all things, believe it*; joyns them who believe it not, with them who deny the Resurrection; or else says, that none denied this, but the same who denied the Resurrection; and that indeed they were called Christians, but in deed and Truth were none.

Whoso-

Whoſoever, I ſay, conſiders theſe things will eaſily grant, that they held it not as their own opinion, but as the Doctrine of the Church and the Faith of Chriſtians.

Hereupon I conclude, whatſoever they held, not as their private opinion, but as the Faith of the Church, that was the Faith of the Church of their time: But this Doctrine they held, not as *their* private opinion, but as the Faith of the Church. *Ergo*, it was and is to be eſteemed the Faith of the Church.

Trypho. "Do ye confeſs that before ye expect the "coming of Chriſt, this place *Hieruſalem* ſhall be again "reſtored, and that your People ſhall be congregated, and "rejoyce together with Chriſt, and the Patriarchs and "the Prophets, *&c.*

Juſtin Martyr. "I have confeſſed to you before, that "both I and many others do believe, as you well know, "that this ſhall be; but that many again, who are (not) "of the pure and holy opinion of Chriſtians, do not "acknowledge this, I have alſo ſignified unto you: "For I have declared unto you, that ſome called Chriſtians, "but being indeed *Atheiſts* and impious *Hereticks*, do gene-"rally teach blaſphemous and Atheiſtical and fooliſh things: "but that you might know that I ſpeak not this to you on-"ly, I will make a Book as near as I can of theſe our diſ-"putations, where I will profeſs in writing that which I "ſay before you; for I reſolve to follow not men, and the "Doctrines of men, but God and the Doctrine of God. "For although you chance to meet with ſome that are "called Chriſtians, which do not confeſs this, but dare "to Blaſpheme the God of *Abraham*, the God of *Iſaac*, and "the God of *Jacob*, which alſo ſay there is no Reſurrecti-"on of the Dead, but that as ſoon as they die their Souls "are received into Heaven, do not ye yet think them "Chriſtians: as neither if a man conſider rightly will he "account the Sadducees and other Sectaries and Hereticks, "as the *Geniſtæ* and the *Meriſtæ* and *Galileans*, and *Phariſees* "and *Hellenians* and *Baptiſts* and other ſuch to be *Jews*; but "only that they are called *Jews*, and the Children of *Abra-*"*ham*, and ſuch as with their lips confeſs God (as God "himſelf

"himſelf cries out) but have their Hearts far from him. "But I and all Chriſtians that in all things believe aright, "both know that there ſhall be a Reſurrection of the "Fleſh, and a thouſand years in *Hieruſalem* reſtored and "adorned and inlarged; according as the Prophets, *Ezekiel* "and *Eſay* and others do teſtifie: for thus ſaith *Iſaiah* of "the time of this thouſand years. *For there ſhall be a new* "*Heaven and a new Earth, and they ſhall not remember the former*, &c. And after. —— "A certain man amongſt us "whoſe name was *John*, one of the Twelve Apoſtles of "Chriſt, in that *Revelation* which was exhibited unto him, "hath foretold — That they which believe our Chriſt "ſhall live in *Hieruſalem* a thouſand years, and that after, "the Univerſal and everlaſting Reſurrection and Judgment "ſhall be.

I have preſumed in the beginning of *Juſtin Martyrs* anſwer to ſubſtitute (not) inſtead of (alſo) becauſe I am confident, that either by chance, or the fraud of ſome ill-willers to the Millinaries opinion; the place has been corrupted, and (κ) turned into (χ) (not) into (alſo.) For if we retain the uſual reading——*But that many who are alſo of the pure and holy opinion of Chriſtians do not acknowledge this, I have alſo ſignified unto you*; then muſt we conclude, that *Juſtin Martyr* himſelf did believe the opinion of them which denied the thouſand years, to be the pure and holy opinion of Chriſtians: and if ſo, why did he not himſelf believe it? nay how could he but believe it to be true, profeſſing it (as he does if the place be right) to be the pure and holy opinion of Chriſtians: for how a falſe Doctrine can be the pure and holy opinion of Chriſtians, what Chriſtian can conceive? or if it may be ſo, how can the contrary avoid the being untrue, unholy and not the opinion of Chriſtians?

Again, if we read the place thus —— *That many who are alſo of the pure and holy opinion of Chriſtians, do not acknowledge this, I have alſo ſignified*: certainly there wll be neither ſenſe nor reaſon, neither coherence nor conſequence in the words following——*For I have told you of many called Chriſtians, but being indeed Atheiſts and Hereticks,*

reticks, that they altogether teach blaſphemous and impious and fooliſh things: for how is this a confirmation or reaſon of, or any way pertinent unto what went before? if there he ſpeak of none but ſuch as were, *puræ piæque Chriſtianorum ſententiæ*, of the pure and holy opinion of Chriſtians. And therefore to diſguiſe this inconſequence, the Tranſlator has thought fit to make uſe of a falſe Tranſlation, and inſtead of——*for I have told you*, to make it, —— *beſides I have told you of many*, &c. Again, if *Juſtin Martyr* had thought this *the pure and holy opinion of Chriſtians*, or them good and holy Chriſtians that held it; why does he rank them with them that denyed the Reſurrection? Why does he ſay afterward —*Although you chance to meet with ſome that are called Chriſtians which do not confeſs this, do not ye think them Chriſtians.* Laſtly, what ſenſe is there in ſaying as he does——*I and all Chriſtians that are of a right belief in all things, believe the Doctrine of the thouſand years*, and that the Scriptures both of the *Old* and *New Teſtament* teach it, and yet ſay ——*That many of the pure and holy opinion of Chriſtians do not believe it?* Upon theſe reaſons I ſuppoſe it is evident, that the place has been corrupted, and it is to be corrected according as I have corrected it, by ſubſtituting ε in the place of ου (not) inſtead of (alſo.) Neither need any man think ſtrange that this misfortune of the change of a Syllable ſhould befal this place, who conſiders that in this place *Juſtin Martyr* tells us that he had ſaid the ſame things before, whereas nothing to this purpoſe appears now in him. And that in *Victorinus* comment on the *Revelation*, wherein, (by S. *Hieroms* acknowledgment) this Doctrine was ſtrongly maintained, there now appears nothing at all for it, but rather againſt it. And now from the place thus reſtored, theſe Obſervations offer themſelves unto us.

1. That *Juſtin Martyr* ſpeaks not as a Doctor, but as a witneſs of the Doctrine of the Church of his time. I (ſaith he) and all Chriſtians that are of a right belief in all things hold this: And therefore from hence according to Cardinal *Perrons* Rule, we are to conclude, not probably but demonſtratively, that this was the Doctrine of the Church of that time.

2. That

2. That they held it as a neceſſary matter, ſo far as to hold them no Chriſtians that held the Contrary: *though you chance to meet with ſome called Chriſtians that do not confeſs this, but dare to Blaſpheme the God of* Abraham, Iſaac *and* Jacob, *&c. Yet do not ye think them Chriſtians*: Now if *Bellarmines* Rule be true, that Councils then determine any thing as matters of Faith, when they pronounce them Hereticks that hold the Contrary; then ſure *Juſtin Martyr* held this Doctrine as a matter of Faith, ſeeing he pronounceth them no Chriſtians, that contradict it.

3. That the Doctrine is grounded upon the Scripture of the *Old* and *New Teſtament* and the *Revelation* of S. *John*, and that by a Doctor and Martyr, of the Church, and ſuch a one as was converted to Chriſtianity within 30 years after the Death of S. *John*, when in all probability there were many alive, that had heard him expound his own words and teach this Doctrine: and if probabilities will not be admitted, this is certain out of the moſt authentical records of the Church, that *Papias* the Diſciple of the Apoſtles Diſciples taught it the Church, profeſſing that he had received it from them that learned it from the Apoſtles: and if after all this, the Church of thoſe Times might Err in a Doctrine ſo clearly derived and authentically delivered, how without extream impudence can any Church in after times, pretend to Infallibility.

The *Millinaries* Doctrine was over-born, by imputing to them that which they held not: by abrogating the Authority of S. *John*'s Revelation, as ſome did: or by derogating from it, as others; aſcribing it not to S. *John* the Apoſtle, but to ſome other *John*, they know not who: which —— *Dionyſius* the firſt known adverſary of this doctrine and his followers; againſt the Tradition of *Irenæus*, *Juſtin Martyr*, and all the Fathers their Anteceſſors: by calling it a Judaical opinion and yet allowing it as probable by corrupting the Authors for it, as *Juſtin*, *Victorinus*, *Severus*.

VI. *A Letter relating to the ſame Subject.*

SIR,

I Pray remember, that if a conſent of Fathers either conſtitute or declare a Truth to be neceſſary, or ſhew the opinion of the Church of their Time; then that opinion of the Jeſuits, concerning Predeſtination upon preſcience (which had no oppoſer before S. *Auſtin*) muſt be ſo, and the contrary Heretical of the Dominicans; and the preſent Church differs from the Ancient, in not eſteeming of it as they did.

Secondly, I pray remember, that if the Fathers be infallible, (when they ſpeak as witneſſes of Tradition) to ſhew the opinion of the Church of their Time, then the opinion of the *Chiliaſts* (which now is a Hereſie in the Church of *Rome*) was once Tradition in the Opinion of the Church.

Thirdly, Since S. *Auſtin* had an opinion, that of whatſoever no beginning was known, that came from the Apoſtles, many Fathers might ſay things to be Tradition upon that ground only; but of this Opinion of the *Chiliaſts*, one of the ancienteſt Fathers *Irenæus* ſays not onely that it was Tradition, but ſets down Chriſts own words when he taught it, and the pedigree of the opinion from Chriſt [a] to *John* his Diſciple; from him to ſeveral Prieſts (whereof *Papias* was one who put it in writing) and ſo downwards; which can be ſhewn from no other Father, for no other opinion, either controverted, or uncontroverted.

Fourthly, That if *Papias* either by his own error, or a deſire to deceive, could cozen the Fathers of the pureſt age in this, why not alſo in other things? why not in twenty as well as one, why not twenty others as well as he.

Fifthly, That if the Fathers could be cozened, how could general Councils ſcape? who you ſay make Tradition one of their Rules, which can only be known from the Fathers?

Sixthly, If they object, how could errors come in, and no beginning of them known? I pray remember to ask them the same Question concerning the *Millenaries*, which lasted uncontradicted, until *Dionysius Alexandrinus* two hundred and fifty years after Christ; and if they tell you that *Papias* was the first beginner, look in *Irenæus*, and he will tell you the contrary. (*Loco citato* l. 5. c. 33.)

Seventhly, Remember, that if I ought not to condemn the Church of *Rome* out of Scripture, because my interpretation may deceive me; then they ought not to build their Infallibility upon it (and less upon her own word) because theirs may deceive them: unless the same thing may be a wall when you lean upon it, and a bulrush when we do.

Eighthly, Remember that they cannot say, they trust not their Interpretation in this, but a consent of Fathers; because the Fathers are not said to be infallible, but as they tell the Opinion of the Church of their time, which is infallible: therefore they must first prove out of Scripture that she is infallible, or else she (who is her self the subject of the Question) cannot be allowed till then to give a verdict for her self.

Ninthly, Remember the *Roman* Church claims no Notes of the Church, but what agree with the *Grecian* too (as Antiquity, Succession, Miracles, &c.) but onely Communion with the Pope and Splendor; both which made for the *Arrians* in *Liberius* his time; and it were a hard Case, that because the *Greeks* are poor upon Earth, they should be shut out of Heaven.

Tenthly, Remember that if we have an Infallible way, we have no use (at least no necessity) of an Infallible Guide; for if we may be saved by following the Scripture as near as we can (though we err) it is as good as any Interpreter to keep unity in charity (which is only needful) though not in opinion: and this cannot be ridiculous, because they say, if any man misinterpret the Council of *Trent*, it shall not damn him; and why (without more ado) may not the same be said of Scripture?

VII. *An Argument againſt the Infallibility of the preſent Church of* Rome, *taken from the Contradictions in your Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation.*

Chillingworth. THat Church is not infallible, which teacheth Contradictions: But the Church of *Rome* teacheth Contradictions. Therefore the Church of *Rome* is not infallible.

Mr. *Daniel.* I deny the Minor.

Chilling. That Church teacheth Contradictions, which teacheth ſuch a Doctrin as contains Contradictions: But the Church of *Rome* teacheth ſuch a Doctrin: Therefore the Church of *Rome* teacheth Contradictions.

Mr. *Daniel.* I deny the Minor.

Chilling. The Doctrin of Tranſubſtantion contains Contradictions: But the Church of *Rome* teacheth the Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation: Therefore the Church of *Rome* teacheth ſuch a Doctrin as contains Contradictions.

Mr. *Dan.* I deny the Major.

Chilling. That the ſame thing at the ſame time ſhould have the true figure of a mans body, and ſhould not have the true figure of a mans body, is a Contradiction: But in the Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation it is taught, that the ſame thing, (*viz.* our Saviour preſent in the Sacrament) has the true figure of a mans body, and has not the true figure of a mans body at the ſame time; therefore the Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation contains Contradictions.

Mr. *Dan.* The Major, though not having all rules required to a contradiction (as boys in Logick know) yet let it paſs.

Chilling. Boys in Logick know no more conditions required to a Contradiction, but that the ſame thing ſhould be affirmed and denied of the ſame thing at the ſame time. For my meaning was, that that ſhould not be accounted the ſame thing, which was conſidered after divers manners.

Mr. *Dan.* I deny the Minor of your ſyllogiſm.

Chilling. I prove it, according to the ſeveral parts of it: And firſt, for the firſt part. He muſt have the Figure of a mans body in the Euchariſt, who is there without any real alteration or difference from the natural body of a man: But our Saviour, according to the *Remiſh* Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation, is in the Sacrament without any real alteration or difference from the natural body of a man: Therefore according to this Doctrin he muſt there have the figure of a mans body. To the ſecond part, that he muſt not have the figure of a mans body in the Sacrament, according to this Doctrin, thus I prove it. He muſt not have the figure of a mans body in the Euchariſt, which muſt not have extenſion there: But our Saviours body, according to the Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation, muſt not have extenſion there; Therefore, according to this doctrin, he muſt not have the figure of a mans body there. The Major of this Syllogiſm I proved, becauſe the figure of a mans body could not be without extenſion. The Minor I proved thus; That muſt not have extenſion in the Euchariſt, whoſe every part is together in one and the ſame point: But according to this Doctrin, every part of our Saviours body muſt be here in one and the ſame point: therefore here it muſt not have extenſion.

Mr. *Dan.* Anſwered, by diſtinguiſhing the Major of the firſt Syllogiſm, and ſaid; that he muſt not have the true figure of a mans body, according to the reaſon of a figure taken in its eſſential conſideration, which is to have *poſitionem partium ſic & ſic extra partes*; but not the accidental conſideration, which is in *ordine ad locum.* And this anſwer he applied for the ſolution of the Minor, ſaying thus, Our Saviour is there without any real alteration intrinſecal, but not extrinſecal; for he is not changed in order to himſelf, but in order to place: Or otherwiſe, he is not altered in his continual exiſtence, which is only *modus eſſentiæ* and inſeparable even by divine power, though altered *in modo exiſtendi*, which is ſituation and required to figure taken in order to place.

Chilling.

Chill. Againſt this it was replied by *Chillingworth*: That the diſtinction of a mans body as conſidered in it ſelf, and as conſidered in reference to place, is vain, and no ſolution of the Argument: And thus he proved it; If it be impoſſible, that any thing ſhould have ſeveral parts one out of another in order, and reference of each to other, without having theſe parts in ſeveral places; then the diſtinction is vain: But it is impoſſible, that any thing ſhould have ſeveral parts one out of another, without having theſe parts in ſeveral places; Therefore the diſtinction is vain.

The Major of this Syllogiſm he took for granted.

The Minor he proved thus: Whatſoever body is in the proper place of another body, muſt of neceſſity be in that very body, by poſſeſſing the demenſions of it: therefore, whatſoever hath ſeveral parts one out of the other, muſt of neceſſity have them one out of the place of the other; and conſequently in ſeveral places.

For illuſtration of this Argument he ſaid; If my head and belly and thighs and legs be all in the very ſame place; of neceſſity my head muſt be in my belly, and my belly in my thighs, and my thighs in my legs, and all of them in my feet, and my feet in all of them; and therefore if my head be out of my belly, it muſt be out of the place where my belly is; and if it be not out of the place where my belly is, it is not out of my belly but in it.

Again, to ſhew that according to the Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation, our Saviours body in the Euchariſt hath not the ſeveral parts of it out of one another, he diſputed thus: Whereſoever there is a body having ſeveral parts one out of the other, there muſt be ſome middle parts ſevering the extreme parts: But here, according to this Doctrin, the extreme parts are not ſevered, but altogether in the ſame point; Therefore here our Saviours Body cannot have parts one out of other.

Mr. *Dan.* To all this (for want of a better Anſwer) gave only this. *Let all Scholars peruſe theſe.* After, upon better conſideration, he wrote by the ſide of the laſt Syllogiſm this: *Quoad entitatem verum eſt, non quoad locum,* that is, according to entity it is true, but not according to place.

place. And to (*Let all Scholars peruſe theſe*) he cauſed this to be added; *And weigh whether there is any new matter*, worth a new Anſwer.

Chillingworth Replyed, That to ſay the extreme parts of a body are ſevered by the middle parts according to their entity, but not according to place, is ridiculous. His reaſons are firſt, Becauſe ſevering of things is nothing elſe, but putting or keeping them in ſeveral places, as every ſilly woman knows; and therefore to ſay, they are ſevered but not according to place, is as if you ſhould ſay, They are heated, but not according to heat; they are cooled, but not according to cold: Indeed is it to ſay, they are ſevered, but not ſevered.

VIII. *An account of what moved the Author to turn a Papiſt, with his own Confutation of the Arguments that perſwaded him thereto.*

I Reconciled my ſelf to the Church of *Rome*, becauſe I thought my ſelf to have ſufficient reaſon to believe, that there was and muſt be always in the World ſome Church, that could not err: and conſequently ſeeing all other Churches diſclaimed this priviledge of not being ſubject to error; the Church of *Rome* muſt be that Church which cannot err.

I was put into doubt of this way which I had choſen, by D. *Stapleton* and others; who limit the Churches freedom from Error to things neceſſary only, and ſuch as without which the Church can be a Church no longer, but granted it ſubject to error in things that were not neceſſary: Hereupon conſidering that moſt of the differences between *Proteſtants* and *Roman* Catholicks; were not touching things neceſſary, but only profitable or lawful; I concluded, that I had not ſufficient ground to believe the *Roman* Church either could not or did not err in any thing, and therefore no ground to be a *Roman* Catholick.

Againſt

Againſt this again I was perſwaded, that it was not ſufficient to believe the Church to be an *infallible believer* of all doctrins neceſſary; but it muſt alſo be granted an *infallible teacher* of what is neceſſary; that is, that we muſt believe not only that the Church teacheth all things neceſſary, but that all is neceſſary to be believed, which the Church teacheth to be ſo: in effect, that the Church is our Guide in the way to Heaven.

Now to believe that the Church was an infallible Guide, and to be believed in all things which ſhe requires us to believe, I was induced: Firſt, becauſe there was nothing that could reaſonably conteſt with the Church about this Office, but the Scripture: and that the Scripture was this Guide, I was willing to believe, but that I ſaw not how it could be made good, without depending upon the Churches authority.

1. That Scripture is the Word of God.
2. That the Scripture is a perfect rule of our duty.
3. That the Scripture is ſo plain in thoſe things that concern our duty, that whoſoever deſires and endeavors to find the will of God, there ſhall either find it, or at leaſt not dangerouſly miſtake it.

Secondly, I was drawn to this belief, becauſe I conceived that it was evident, out of the Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*, that there muſt be unto the worlds end a Succeſſion of Paſtors, by adhering to whom, men might be kept from wavering in matters of faith, and from being carried up and down with every wind of falſe doctrin.

That no Succeſſion of Paſtors could guard their adherents from danger of error, if themſelves were ſubject unto error, either in teaching that to be neceſſary which is not ſo, or denying that to be neceſſary which is ſo: and therefore,

That there was and muſt be ſome Succeſſion of Paſtors, which was an infallible guide in the way to Heaven; and which ſhould not poſſibly teach any thing to be neceſſary which was not ſo; nor any thing not neceſſary which was ſo: upon this ground I concluded, that ſeeing there muſt be ſuch a Succeſſion of Paſtors, as was an infallible guide;

and

and there was no other (but that of the Church of *Rome*) even by the confeſſion of all other Societies of Paſtors in the world; that therefore that Succeſſion of Paſtors is that infallible Guide of Faith which all men muſt follow.

Upon theſe grounds I thought it neceſſary for my ſalvation, to believe the *Roman* Church, in all that ſhe thought to be, and propoſed as neceſſary.

Againſt theſe Arguments it hath been demonſtrated unto me; and Firſt againſt the firſt. That the reaſon why we are to believe the Scripture to be the word of God, neither is nor can be the Authority of the preſent Church of *Rome*, which cannot make good her Authority any other way, but by pretence of Scripture: and therefore ſtands not unto Scripture (no not in reſpect of us) in the relation of a Foundation to a building, but of a building to a Foundation, doth not ſupport Scripture, but is ſupported by it. But the general conſent of Chriſtians of all Nations and Ages, a far greater company than that of the Church of *Rome*, and delivering univerſally the Scripture for the word of God, is the ordinary external reaſon why we believe it: whereunto the Teſtimonies of the Jews, enemies of Chriſt, add no ſmall moment for the Authority of ſome part of it.

That whatſoever ſtood upon the ſame ground of Univerſal Tradition with Scripture, might juſtly challenge belief, as well as Scripture: but that no Doctrin not written in Scripture, could juſtly pretend to as full Tradition as the Scripture, and therefore we had no reaſon to believe it with that degree of faith, wherewith we believe the Scripture.

That it is unreaſonable to think, that he that reads the Scripture, and uſes all means appointed for this purpoſe, with an earneſt deſire and with no other end, but to find the will of God and obey it, if he miſtake the meaning of ſome doubtful places, and fall unwillingly into ſome errors, unto which no vice or paſſion betrays him, and is willing to hear reaſon from any man that will undertake to ſhew him his error: I ſay, that it is unreaſonable to think, that a God of goodneſs will impute ſuch an error to ſuch a man.

Againſt

Againſt the ſecond it was demonſtrated unto me, that the place I built on ſo confidently, was no Argument at all for the Infallibility of the Succeſſion of Paſtors in the *Roman* Church, but a very ſtrong Argument againſt it.

Firſt, no Argument for it; becauſe it is not certain, nor can ever be proved, that S. *Paul* ſpeaks there of any ſucceſſion; *Epheſ.* 4. 11, 12, 13. For let that be granted which is deſired, that in the 13. ver. by [*until we all meet*] is meant, until all the Children of God meet in the Unity of Faith; that is, unto the Worlds end: yet it is not ſaid there, *that he gave Apoſtles and Prophets*, &c. *which ſhould continue*, &c. *until we all meet*, by connecting the 13. *ver.* to the 11. But he gave (then upon his Aſcenſion and miraculouſly endowed) Apoſtles and Prophets, *&c.* for the work of the miniſtry, for the Conſummation of the Saints, for the Edification of the Body of Chriſt, until we all meet, that is, if you will, unto the Worlds end. Neither is there any incongruity, but that the Apoſtles and Prophets, *&c.* which lived then, may in good ſenſe be ſaid, now at this time and ever hereafter to do thoſe things which they are ſaid to do: For who can deny but S. *Paul* the Apoſtle and Doctor of the Gentiles, and S. *John* the Evangeliſt and Prophet, do at this very time (by their writings, though not by their perſons) do the work of the miniſtry, conſummate the Saints, and Edifie the Body of Chriſt.

Secondly, it cannot be ſhewn or proved from hence, that there is or was to be any ſuch ſucceſſion: becauſe S. *Paul* here tells us only, that he gave ſuch in the time paſt, not that he promiſed ſuch in the time to come.

Thirdly, it is evident, that God promiſed no ſuch ſucceſſion, becauſe it is not certain that he hath made good any ſuch promiſe; for who is ſo impudent as to pretend, that there are now, and have been in all Ages ſince Chriſt, ſome Apoſtles and ſome Prophets and ſome Evangeliſts and ſome Paſtors and Teachers: Especially ſuch as he here ſpeaks of, that is, endowed with ſuch gifts as Chriſt gave upon his Aſcenſion; of which he ſpeaks in the 8 *ver.* ſaying; *He led Captivity Captive, and gave gifts*

unto men. And that thoſe gifts were —— Men endowed with extraordinary Power and Supernatural gifts —— it is apparent, becauſe theſe Words, *and he gave ſome Apoſtles, ſome Prophets*, &c. are added by way of explication and illuſtration of that which was ſaid before —— *and he gave gifts unto Men*: And if any man except hereunto, that though the Apoſtles and Prophets and Evangeliſts were extraordinary and for the Plantation of the Goſpel, yet Paſtors were ordinary and for continuance: I anſwer, it is true, ſome Paſtors are ordinary and for continuance, but not ſuch as are here ſpoken of: not ſuch as are endowed with the ſtrange and heavenly gifts, which Chriſt gave not only to the Apoſtles and Prophets and Evangeliſts, but to the inferior Paſtors and Doctors of his Church, at the firſt Plantation of it: And therefore S. *Paul* in the 1ſt. to the *Corinth.* 12. 28. (to which place we are referred by the Margent of the Vulgar Tranſlation, for the explication of this,) places this gift of teaching amongſt, and prefers it before many other miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghoſt: Paſtors there are ſtill in the Church, but not ſuch as *Titus* and *Timothy* and *Apollos* and *Barnabas*: not ſuch as can juſtly pretend to immediate inſpiration and illumination of the Holy Ghoſt: And therefore ſeeing there neither are nor have been for many Ages in the Church, ſuch Apoſtles and Prophets, *&c.* as here are ſpoken of, it is certain he promiſed none; or otherwiſe we muſt blaſphemouſly charge him with breach of his promiſe.

Secondly, I anſwer, that if by *dedit he gave*, be meant *promiſit*, he *promiſed* for ever; then all were promiſed and all ſhould have continued. If by *dedit* be not meant *promiſit*, then he promiſed none ſuch, nor may we expect any ſuch by vertue of, or warrant from this Text that is here alledged: And thus much for the firſt Aſſumpt which was, that the place was no Argument for an infallible ſucceſſion in the Church of *Rome.*

Now for the ſecond, That it is a ſtrong Argument againſt it, thus I make it good.

The Apoſtles and Prophets and Evangeliſts and Paſtors, which our Saviour gave upon his Aſcenſion, were given by

by him that they might Conſummate the Saints, do the work of the Miniſtry, Edifie the Body of Chriſt, until we all come into the Unity of Faith, that we be not like Children wavering and carried up and down with every wind of Doctrine. The Apoſtles and Prophets, *&c.* that then were, do not now in their own perſons and by oral inſtruction do the work of the Miniſtry, to the intent we may be kept from wavering and being carried up and down with every wind of Doctrine: therefore they do this ſome other way: Now there is no other way by which they can do it, but by their writings; and therefore by their writings they do it: therefore by their writings and believing of them we are to be kept from wavering in matters of Faith: therefore the Scriptures of the Apoſtles and Prophets and Evangeliſts are our Guides. Therefore not the Church of *Rome.*

FINIS.

AN ANSWER

To Some

PASSAGES

IN

Rushworths Dialogues.

BEGINNING

At the Third Dialogue Section 12. p. 181. Ed. *Paris*, 1654.

ABOUT

TRADITIONS.

LONDON,

Printed for *James Adamson*, at the *Angel* in *S. Pauls* Church-Yard, 1687.

AN ANSWER

To some passages in

Rushworths Dialogues.

BEGINNING AT
The Third Dialogue, §. 12. *p.* 181. Ed. *Paris*, 1654.

ABOUT TRADITIONS.

Uncle. DO you think there is such a City as *Rome* or *Constantinople?*
Nephew. That I do, I would I knew what I ask as well.

CHILLINGWORTH.

First I should have answered that in propriety of Speech I could not say that I *knew* it, but that I did as undoubtedly *believe* it, as those things which I did know. For though (as I conceive) we may be properly said to believe that which we know, yet we cannot say truly, that we know that which we only believe upon report and hearsay, be it never so constant, never so general: For seeing the generality of men is made up of particulars, and every particular man may deceive and be deceived, it is not impossible, though exceedingly improbable, that all men should conspire

conspire to do so. Yet I deny not that the popular phrase of Speech will very well bear, that we may say we *know* that which in truth we only *believe*, provided the grounds of our belief be morally certain.

Neither do I take any exception to the Nephews answers, made to his Uncles 2, 3, 4. and 5. Interrogatories. But grant willingly as to the first, that it is not much material whether I remember or not any particular Author of such a general and constant report. Then, that the Testimony of one or two Witnesses, though never so credible, could add nothing to that belief which is already at the height, nay perhaps that my own seeing these Cities would make no accession, add no degree to the strength and firmness of my Faith concerning this matter, only it would change the kind of my assent, and make me *know* that which formerly I did but *believe*.

To the fourth, that seeming Reasons are not much to be regarded against sense or experience and moral Certainties (but withal I should have told my Uncle, that I fear his supposition is hardly possible, and that the nature of the thing will not admit, that there should be any great, nay any probable reasons invented to perswade me that there never was such a City as *London*) and therefore if any man should go about to perswade me that there never was such a City as *London*; That there were no such men as called themselves, or were called by others Protestants, in *England*, in the days of Q. *Elizabeth*, perhaps such a mans Wit might delight me, but his reasons sure would never perswade me.

Hitherto we should have gone hand in hand together, but whereas in the next place he says —— *In like manner then you do not doubt, but a Catholick living in a Catholick Country, may undoubtedly know what was the publick Religion of his Country in his Fathers days, and that so assuredly that it were a meer madness for him to doubt thereof.* —I should have craved leave to tell my Uncle that he presumed too far upon his Nephews yielding disposition. For that as it is a far more easie thing to know, and more authentically testified, that there were some men called Protestants

stants by themselves and others, than what opinions these Protestants held, divers men holding divers things, which yet were all called by this name. So is it far more easie for a *Roman Catholick* to know that in his Fathers days there were some men, for their outward Communion with and subordination to the Bishop of *Rome* called *Roman Catholicks*, than to know what was the Religion of those men who went under this name, For they might be as different one from another in their belief, as some Protestants are from others.

As for example, had I lived before the *Lateran* Council which condemned *Berengarius*, possibly I might have known that the belief of the *Real presence* of Christ in the Sacrament was part of the publick Doctrine of my Country: But whether the Real absence of the Bread and Wine after Consecration, and their Transubstantiation into Christs Body, were likewise *Catholick* Doctrine at that time, *that*, I could not have known, seeing that all men were at liberty to hold it was so, or it was not so.

Moreover I should have told my Uncle, that living now, I know it is *Catholick* Doctrine, That the Souls of the Blessed enjoy the Vision of God: But if I had lived in the Reign of *Pope John* the XXII, I should not have known that then it was so, considering that many good Catholicks before that time had believed, and then, even the *Pope* himself did believe the contrary: and he is warranted by *Bellarmine* for doing so, because the Church had not then defined it.

I should have told him further that either Catholicks of the present time do so differ in their belief, that what some hold lawful and pious, others condemn as unlawful and impious: or else that all now consent, and consequently make it *Catholick* Doctrine, That it is not unlawful to make the usual Pictures of the *Trinity*, and to set them in Churches to be adored. But had I lived in S. *Austins* time, I should then have been taught another Lesson: To wit, that this Doctrine and practice was impious, and the contrary Doctrine Catholick.

I should have told him that now I was taught that the Doctrine of Indulgences was an Apostolick Tradition: but had I lived 600 years since, and found that in all antiquity there was no use of them: I should either have thought the Primitive Church no faithful Steward in defrauding mens Souls of this Treasure intended by God to them, and so necessary for them, or rather that the Doctrine of Indulgences now practised in the Church of *Rome* was not then Catholick.

I should have told him that the general practice of *Roman* Catholicks now taught me that it was a pious thing to offer Incense and Tapers to the Saints and to their Pictures: But had I lived in the Primitive Church, I should with the Church have condemned it in the *Collyridians* as Heretical.

I should have represented to him *Erasmus* his complaint against the Protestants, whose departing from the *Roman* Church occasioned the determining, and exacting the belief of many points as necessary, wherein before *Luther* men enjoyed the Liberties of their Judgments and Tongues and Pens. *Antea*, saies he, *licebat varias agitare quæstiones, de potestate Pontificis, de Condonationibus, de restituendo, de Purgatorio: nunc tutum non est hiscere, ne de his quidèm, quæ piè verèque dicuntur. Et credere cogimur, quod homo gignit ex se opera meritoria, quod benefactis meretur vitam æternam, etiam de condigno, Quòd B. Virgo potest imperare Filio cum Patre regnanti ut exaudiat hujus aut illius preces, aliaque permulta ad quæ piæ mentes inhorrescunt.* And from hence I should have collected, as I think very probably, that it was not then such a known and certain thing, what was the Catholick Faith in many points which now are determined, but that divers men who held external Communion with that Church which now holds these as matters of Faith, conceived themselves no waies bound to do so, but at liberty to hold as they saw reason.

I should have shewed him by the confession of another Learned Catholick, That through the negligence of the Bishops in former Ages, and the indiscreet Devotion of the People many opinions and practices were brought into the Church, which at first perhaps were but wink'd at, after

after tolerated, then approved, and at length after they had spread themselves into a seeming Generality, confirmed for good and Catholick: and that therefore there was no certainty, that they came from the beginning whose beginning was not known.

I should have remembred him that even by the acknowledgment of the Council of *Trent*, many corruptions and superstitions had by insensible degrees insinuated themselves into the very Mass and Offices of the Church, which they thought fit to cast out: and therefore seeing that some abuses have come in, God knows how, and have been cast out again, who can ascertain me that some Errors have not got in, and while men slept (for it is apparent they did sleep) gathered such strength, gotten such deep root, and so incorporated themselves, like Ivy in a Wall, in the State and polity of the *Roman* Church, that to pull them up had been to pull them down, by rasing the Foundation on which it stands, to wit, the Churches Infallibility? Besides as much water passes under the Mill which the Miller sees not, so who can warrant me that some old corruptions, might not escape from them, and pass for Original and Apostolick Traditions? I say *might not*; though they had been as studious to reduce all to the primitive State, as they were to preserve them in the present State, as diligent to cast out all Postnate and introduct opinions, as they were to persuade men that there were none such, but all as truly Catholick and Apostolick as they were *Roman.*

I should have declared unto him that many things reckoned up in the Roll of Traditions are now grown out of fashion and out of use in the Church of *Rome:* and therefore that either they believed them not, whatever they pretended, or were not so obedient to the Apostles command as they themselves interpret it——*Keep the Traditions which ye have received, whether by word or by our Epistle.*

And seeing there have been so many vicissitudes and changes in the *Roman* Church: Catholick Doctrines growing exolete, and being degraded from their Catholicism, and perhaps depress into the number of Heresies: Points

of Indifference, or at least *Aliens* from the Faith, getting first to be Inmates, after, procuring to be made *Denizons*, and in process of time necessary members of the Body of the Faith: Nay Old Heresies sometimes like old Snakes, casting their Skin and their Poyson together, and becoming wholsom and Catholick Doctrines. I must have desired pardon of my Uncle, if I were not so undoubtedly certain what was and what was not Catholick Doctrine in the days of my Fathers.

Nay perhaps I should have gone further and told him, That I was not fully assured what was the Catholick Doctrine in some points, no not at this present time. For instance, to lay the Axe unto the Root of the Tree: the infallibility of the present Church of *Rome*, in determining controversies of Faith, is esteemed indeed by divers that I have met with, not only an Article of Faith, but a Foundation of all other Articles. But how do I know there are not, nay why should I think there are not in the World divers good Catholicks of the same mind touching this matter, which *Mirandula*, *Panormitan*, *Cusanus*, *Florentinus*, *Clemangis*, *Waldensis*, *Occham*, and divers others were of, who were so far from holding this Doctrine the Foundation of Faith, that they would not allow it any place in the Fabrick.

Now *Bellarmine* has taught us that no Doctrine is Catholick, nor the contrary Heretical, that is denied to be so by some good Catholicks. From hence I collect that in the time of the forenamed Authors, this was not Catholick Doctrine, nor the contrary Heretical; and being then not so, how it could since become so, I cannot well understand: If it be said that it has since been defined by a General Council; I say first, This is false, no Council has been so foolish as to define that a Council is Infallible, for unless it were presumed to be Infallible before, who or what could assure us of the Truth of this definition? Secondly if it were true it were ridiculous: for he that would question the Infallibility of all Councils in all their Decrees, would as well question the Infallibility of this Council in this Decree. This therefore was not, is not,

nor

nor ever can be an Article of Faith, unless God himself would be pleased (which is not very likely) to make some new Revelation of it from Heaven.

The πρῶτον ψεῦδος, the Fountain of the Error in this matter is this: That the whole Religion of the *Roman Church* and every point of it, is conceived or pretended to have issued Originally out of the Fountain of Apostolick Tradition, either in themselves or in the principles from which they are evidently deducible. Whereas it is evident that many of their Doctrines, may be Originally derived from the Decrees of Councils, many from Papal definitions, many from the Authority of some great Man; To which purpose it is very remarkable what *Gregory Nazianzen* says of *Athanasius*. * *What pleased him was a law to men, what did not please him was as a thing prohibited by Law; his Decrees were to them like* Moses *his Tables; and he had a greater veneration paid him than seems to be due from men to Saints.*

* Τοῦτο μὲν νόμος καὶ ἀνυπεύθυνος ὅ τι ἐκείνῳ ἐδόκει, καὶ τοῦτο ἀπώμοτον πάλιν, ὃ μὴ ἐδόκει, κἂν πλάκας Μωϋσέως αὐτῷ τὰ ἐκείνου δόγματα, καὶ πλέον τὸ σέβας ἢ περὶ ἀνθρώπων τοῖς ἁγίοις ὀφειλέτω. Orat XXI. *in* Laudem Athanasii.

And as memorable that in the late great Controversie about Predetermination and Free-will, disputed before *Pope Clement* VII. by the Jesuits and Dominicans, The *Popes* resolution was, if he had determined the matter, to define for that opinion which was most agreeable, not to Scripture, nor to Apostolick Tradition, nor to a consent of Fathers, but to the Doctrine of S. *Austin*: so that if the *Pope* had made an Article of Faith of this Controversie, it is evident S. *Austin* had been the Rule of it.

Sometimes upon erroneous grounds Customs have been brought in, God knows how, and after have spread themselves through the whole Church. Thus *Gordonius Huntleius* confesses, that because Baptism and the Eucharist had been anciently given both together to men of ripe years, when they were converted to Christianity; Afterwards by Error when Infants were Baptized, they gave the Eucharist also to Infants. This Custom in short time grew Universal, and in S. *Austins* time passed currantly for an Apostolick Tradition, and the Eucharist was thought as necessary for them as Baptism. This Custom the Church of *Rome* hath again cast out, and in so doing profest either

ther her no regard to the traditions of the Apostles, or that this was none of that number. But yet she cannot possibly avoid but that this example is a proof sufficient that many things may get in by Error into the Church, and by degrees obtain the esteem and place of Apostolick Traditions which yet are not so.

The Custom of denying the Laity the Sacramental Cup, and the Doctrine that it is lawful to do so, who can pretend to derive from Apostolick Tradition? Especially when the * Council of Constance the Patron of it, confesses that Christs institution was under both kinds, and that the faithful in the Primitive Church received it in both. —— *Licet Christus*, &c. *Although Christ after his Supper instituted and administred this venerable Sacrament under both kinds.*——*Although in the Primitive Church this Sacrament were received by the faithful under both kinds.*——Non obstante, *&c.*——*Yet all this notwithstanding this Custom for the avoiding of Scandals* (to which the Primitive Church was as obnoxious as the present is) *was upon just reason brought in, that Laicks should receive only under one kind.*

* *Sess.* XIII.

Brought in therefore it was, and so is one of those Doctrines which *Lerinensis* calls — *inducta non tradita, inventa non accepta*, &c. therefore all the Doctrine of the *Roman* Church does not descend from Apostolick Tradition.

But if this Custom came not from the Apostles, from what Original may we think that it descended? Certaintainly from no other than from the belief of the substantial presence of whole Christ under either kind. For this opinion being once setled in the Peoples minds, that they had as much by one kind as by both; both Priest and People quickly began to think it superfluous, to do the same thing twice at the same time; and thereupon, being (as I suppose) the Custom required that the Bread should be received first, having received that, they were contented that the Priest should save the pains, and the Parish the charge of unnecessary reiteration. This is my Conjecture which I submit to better judgments; but whether it be true or false, one thing from hence is certain,

That

That immemorial Customs may by degrees prevail upon the Church, such as have no known beginning nor Author, of which yet this may be evidently known, that their beginning whensoever it was, was many years, nay, many Ages after the Apostles.

* S. *Paul* commands that nothing be done in the Church but for edification. He says, and if that be not enough, he proves in the same place, that it is not for edification that either Publick Prayers, Thanksgiving and Hymns to God, or Doctrine to the People should be in any Language which the Assistants generally understand not; and thereupon forbids any such practice though it were in a Language miraculously infused into the speaker by the Holy Ghost: unless he himself or some other present could and would interpret. He tells us that to do otherwise is to speak into the Air: That it is to play the *Barbarians* to one another: That to such Blessings and Thanksgivings, the ignorant for want of understanding cannot say *Amen*. He clearly intimates that to think otherwise is to be Children in understanding. Lastly, in the end of the Chapter he tells all that were Prophets and Spiritual among the *Corinthians*, That the things written by him are the Commandments of God. Hereupon *Lyranus* upon the place acknowledgeth that in the Primitive Church, Blessings and all other Services were done in the Vulgar Tongue. Cardinal *Cajeton* likewise upon the place tells us that out of this Doctrine of S. *Paul* it is consequent, That it were better for the Edification of the Church, that the publick Prayers which are said in the Peoples hearing, should be delivered in a Language common both to the Clergy and the People. And I am confident that the Learnedst Antiquary in the *Roman* Church cannot, nay that *Baronius* himself, were he alive again, could not produce so much as one example of any one Church, one City, one Parish in all the Christian World, for five hundred years after Christ, where the Sermons to the People were in one Language, and the Service in another. Now it is confest on all hands to be against sense and reason, that Sermons should be made to the People in

1 *Cor.* 14. 26. 27, 28. 9. 11. 16. 20. 37.

any

any Language not understood by them, and therefore it follows of necessity, that their Service likewise was in those Tongues which the People of the place understood.

But what talk we of 500. years after Christ? when even the *Lateran* Council held in the year 1215. makes this Decree. *Quoniam in plerisque—— Because in many parts within the same City and Dioceſs, People are mixed of divers Languages, having under one Faith divers rites and fashions, we strictly command that the Bishops of the said Cities or Dioceſes provide fit and able men, who according to the diversities of their Rites and Languages may celebrate Divine Services and administer the Sacraments of the Church, instructing them both in word and example.*

Now after all this if any man will still maintain, that the Divine Service in unknown Tongues is a matter of Apostolick Tradition, I must needs think the World is grown very impudent.

There are divers Doctrines in the *Roman* Church which have not yet arrived to the honour to be *Donatæ civitate*, to be received into the number of Articles of Faith; which yet press very hard for it, and through the importunity and multitude of their Attorneys that plead for them, in process of time may very probably be admitted. Of this rank are the Blessed Virgins Immaculate conception, The *Popes* Infallibility in determining Controversies, His superiority to Councils, His indirect Power over Princes in Temporalties, *&c.* Now as these are not yet matters of Faith and Apostolick Traditions, yet in after Ages in the days of our great Grandchildren may very probably become so, so why should we not fear and suspect, that many things now pass currantly as points of Faith which *Ecclesia ab Apostolis, Apostoli à Christo, Christus à Deo recepit*, which perhaps in the days of our great Grandfathers had no such reputation.

Cardinal *Perron* teaches us two Rules whereby to know the Doctrine of the Church in any Age. The first is when the most eminent Fathers of any Age agree in the affirmation of any Doctrine, and none of their Contemporaries oppose or condemn them, that is to be accounted the

the Doctrine of the Church. The second: when one or more of these Eminent Fathers, speak of any Doctrine not as Doctors but as witnesses, and say, not, *I think so, or hold so,* but, *the Church holds and believes this to be Truth.* This is to be accounted the Doctrine of the Church. Now if neither of these Rules be good and certain, then are we destitute of all means to know what was the publick Doctrine of the Church in the days of our Fathers. But on the other side, if either of them be true, we run into a worse inconvenience; for then surely the Doctrine of the Millinaries must be acknowledged to have been the Doctrine of the Church in the very next Age after the Apostles. For both the most eminent Fathers of that time, and even all whose Monuments are extant, or mention made of them, *viz. Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Melito Sardensis,* agree in the affirmation of this point, and none of their contemporary writers oppose or condemn it: And besides they speak not as Doctors but as Witnesses, not as of their own private opinion, but as Apostolick Tradition and the Doctrine of the Church.

Horantius and out of him *Franciscus a Sancta Clara* teach us that under the Gospel there is no where extant any precept of Invocating Saints, and tell us that the Apostles reason of their giving no such precept was, lest the converted Gentiles might think themselves drawn over from one kind of Idolatry to another. If this reason be good, I hope then the position whereof it is the reason is true, *viz.* that the Apostles did neither command nor teach, nor advise, nor persuade the converted Gentiles to invocate Saints, for the reason here rendred serves for all alike, and if they did not, and for this reason did not so: how then in Gods name comes invocation of Saints to be an Apostolick Tradition?

The Doctrines of Purgatory, Indulgences, and Prayer to deliver Souls out of Purgatory are so closely conjoyned, that they must either stand or fall together; at least, the first being the Foundation of the other two, if that be not Apostolick Tradition, the rest cannot be so. And if that be so, what meant the Author of the Book of Wis-

dom to tell us that (after Death) *the Souls of the righteous are in the hand of God, and there shall no torment touch them.* What means S. *John* to teach us, That they are *Blessed which Die in the Lord, for that they rest from their Labours.* But above all what meant Bishop *Fisher* in his Confutation of *Luthers* assertion so to prevaricate as to me he seems to do in the 18th. Art. in saying, *multos fortasse movet,* &c. *Peradventure many are moved not to place too great Faith in Indulgences, because the use of them may seem not of long standing in the Church, and a very late invention among Christians. To whom I answer that* * *it is not certain by whom they began first to be taught. Yet some use there was of them, as they say very Ancient among the* Romans, *which we are given to understand by the Stations which were so frequented in that City. Moreover they say* Gregory *the first granted some in his time.* And after *Cæterum ut dicere cæpimus,* &c. —— *But as we were saying, there are many things of which in the Primitive Church no mention was made, which yet upon doubts arising are become perspicuous through the diligence of after times. Certainly, (to return to our business) no* Orthodox *man now doubts whether there be a Purgatory, of which yet among the Ancients there was made very rare or no mention. Moreover the* Greeks *to this very day believe not Purgatory. Who so will let him read the writings of the Ancient* Greeks, *and I think he shall find no speech of Purgatory, or else very rarely. The Latines also received not this verity all at once but by little and little. Neither was the Faith whether of Purgatory or Indulgences so necessary in the Primitive Church as now it is, for then Charity was so fervent that every one was most ready to Die for Christ. Crimes were very rare, and those which were, were punished by the* Canons *with great severity. But now a great part of the People would rather put off Christianity than suffer the rigour of the* Canons. *That not without the great Wisdom of the Holy Spirit, it hath come to pass that after the course of so many years, the Faith of Purgatory and the use of Indulgences hath been by the* Orthodox *generally received as long as there was no care of Purgatory, no man look'd after Indulgences, for all the Credit of Indulgences depends on that. Take away*

* *Therefore it is not true that all the* Roman *Doctrines were taught by Christ and his Apostles.*

away Purgatory and what need is there of Indulgences. We therefore considering that Purgatory was a long while unknown. That after, partly upon Revelations partly upon Scripture it was believed by some, and that so at length the Faith of it was most generally received by the Orthodox Church, shall easily find out some reason of Indulgences. Seeing therefore it was so late ere Purgatory was known and received by the Universal Church, who now can wonder touching Indulgences, that in the Primitive Church there was no use of them? Indulgences therefore began after men had trembled a while at the Torments of Purgatory. For then it is credible the Holy Fathers began to think more carefully by what means they might provide for their Flocks a remedy against those Torments, for them especially who had not time enough to fulfil the Penance which the Canons *enjoyned.*

Erasmus tell us of himself, that though he did certainly know and could prove, that *Auricular Confession* such as is in use in the *Roman* Church, were not of Divine institution: yet he would not say so, because he conceived Confession a great restraint from sin, and very profitable for the times he lived in, and therefore thought it expedient, that men should rather by Error hold that necessary and commanded, which was only profitable and advised, than by believing, though truly the non-necessity of it to neglect the use of that, as by experience we see most men do which was so beneficial: If he thought so of Confession, and yet thought it not fit to speak his mind, why might he not think the like of other points, and yet out of discretion and Charity hold his peace? And why might not others of his time do so as well as he: and if so, how shall I be assured that in the Ages before him there were not other men alike minded, who though they knew and saw Errors and Corruptions in the Church, yet conceiving more danger in the remedy, than harm in the disease, were contented *hoc Catone* —— to let things alone as they were, lest by attempting to pluck the Ivy out of the Wall, they might pull down the Wall it self, with which the Ivy was so incorporated.

Sir *Edwin Sandys* relates that in his Travels he met

with divers men, who, though they believed the Pope to be Antichriſt, and his Church Antichriſtian, yet thought themſelves not bound to ſeparate from the Communion of it: nay thought themſelves bound not to do ſo: becauſe the True Church was to be the Seat of Antichriſt, from the Communion whereof no man might divide himſelf upon any pretence whatſoever.

And much to this purpoſe is that which *Charron* tells us in his third *Verité, cap.* 4. §. 13. 15. That although all that which the Proteſtants ſay falſly of the Church of *Rome*, were true, yet for all this they muſt not depart from it: and again, Though the Pope were Antichriſt, and the Eſtate of the Church, were ſuch (that is as corrupt both in diſcipline and Doctrine) as they (Proteſtants) pretend, yet they muſt not go out of it. Both theſe aſſertions he proves at large in the above-cited Paragraphs, with very many and very plauſible reaſons: which I believe would prove his intent, had not the corruptions of the *Roman* Church poſſeſſed and infected even the publick Service of God among them, in which their Communion was required: and did not the Church of *Rome* require the *Belief* of all her Errors, as the condition of her Communion. But howſoever be his reaſons concluſive or not concluſive certainly this was the profeſt opinion of him, and divers others; as by name *Caſſander* and *Baldwin*, who though they thought as ill of the Doctrine of the moſt prevailing part of the Church of *Rome*; as Proteſtants do, yet thought it their duty not to ſeparate from her Communion. And if there were any conſiderable number of conſiderable men thus minded (as I know not why any man ſhould think there was not) then it is made not only a moſt difficult, but even an impoſſible thing to know what was the *Catholick* Judgment of our Fathers in the points of controverſie: ſeeing they might be joyned in Communion, and yet very far divided in opinion. They might all live in obedience to the Pope, and yet ſome think him head of the Church by Divine right: others (as a great part of the *French Church* at this day) by Eccleſiaſtical conſtitution; others by neither, but

by

by Practice and Usurpation, wherein yet because he had Prescription of many Ages for him he might not justly be disturbed.

All might go to Confession and yet some only think it necessary; others only profitable. All might go to Mass and the other Services of the Church, and some only like and approve the Language of it: others only tolerate it and wish it altered if it might be, without greater inconvenience. All might receive the Sacrament, and yet some believe it to be the Body and Blood of Christ, others only a Sacrament of it. Some that the Mass was a true and proper Sacrifice, others only a Commemorative Sacrifice, or the Commemoration of a Sacrifice. Some that it was lawful for the Clergy to deny the Laiety the Sacramental Cup: others that it was lawful for them to receive in one kind only, seeing they could not in both. Some might adore Christ as present there according to his Humanity, others as present according to his Divine Nature only. Some might pray for the Dead as believing them in Purgatory: others upon no certain ground, but only that they should rather have their Prayers and Charity which wanted them not, than that they which did want them should not have them. Some might pray to Saints upon a belief that they heard their Prayers and knew their Hearts; others might pray to them meaning nothing but to pray by them, that God for their sakes would grant their Prayers: others thirdly, might not pray to them at all, as thinking it unnecessary, others as fearing it unlawful, yet because they were not fully resolved, only forbearing it themselves, and not condemning it in others.

Uncle. I pray you then remember also what it is that Protestants do commonly taunt and check Catholicks with, is it not that they believe Traditions?

It is a meer Calumny that Protestants condemn all kind of Traditions, who subscribe very willingly to that of *Vincentius Lerinensis.* That Christian Religion is ——*res tradita non inventa,* a matter of Tradition not of mans invention, is, what the Church received from the Apostles, (and by consequence what the Apostles delivered to the Church)

Church) and the Apostles from Christ, and Christ from God. *Chemnitius* in his Examen of the Council of *Trent* hath liberally granted seven sorts of Traditions, and Protestants find no fault with him for it. Prove therefore any Tradition to be Apostolick, which is not written. Shew that there is some known Word of God which we are commanded to believe, that is not contained in the Books of the *Old* and *New Testament*, and we shall quickly shew that we believe Gods Word because it is Gods, and not because it is written. If there were any thing not written which had come down to us with as full and Universal a Tradition as the unquestioned Books of Canonical Scripture, That thing should I believe as well as the Scripture: but I have long sought for some such thing, and yet I am to seek: Nay I am confident no one point in Controversie between Papists and Protestants can go in upon half so fair Cards, for to gain the esteem of an Apostolick Tradition, as those things which are now decried on all hands, I mean the opinion of the *Chiliasts*; and *the Communicating Infants*. The latter by the confession of Cardinal *Perron*, *Maldonate*, and *Binius* was the Custom of the Church for 600 years at least: It is expressly and in terms vouched by S. *Austin* for the Doctrine of the Church and an Apostolick Tradition: it was never instituted by General Council, but in the use of the Church, as long before the First general Council as S. *Cyprian* before the Council. There is no known Author of the beginning of it: all which are the Catholick marks of an Apostolick Tradition, and yet this you say is not so, or if it be, why have you abolisht it? The former Lineally derives its pedigree from our Saviour to St. *John*: from S. *John* to *Papias*: from *Papias* to *Justin Martyr*, *Irenæus*, *Melito Sardensis*, *Tertullian* and others of the two first Ages: who as they generally agree in the Affirmation of this Doctrine, and are not contradicted by any of their Predecessors: so some of them at least, speak to the point not as Doctors but Witnesses, and deliver it for the Doctrine of the Church and Apostolick Tradition, and condemn the contrary as Heresie. And therefore if there

there be any unwritten Traditions, these certainly must be admitted first: or if these which have so fair pretence to it must yet be rejected: I hope then we shall have the like liberty to put back Purgatory, and Indulgences, and Transubstantiation, and the Latin Service, and the Communion in one kind, *&c.* none of which is of Age enough to be Page to either of the forenamed Doctrines, especially the opinion of the Millenaries.

Uncle. What think you means this word Tradition? No other thing certainly but that we confute all our Adversaries by the Testimony of the former Church; saying unto them, this was the belief of our Fathers; Thus were we taught by them and they by theirs, without stop or stay till you come to Christ.

We confute our Adversaries by saying thus——Truly a very easie confutation: But saying and proving are two Mens Offices; and therefore though you be excellent in the former, I fear when it comes to the Tryal, you will be found defective in the Latter.

Uncle. And this no other but the *Roman* Church did or could ever pretend to, which being in truth undeniable, and they cannot choose but grant the thing; Their last refuge is to laugh, and say that both Fathers and Councils did Err because they were men, as if Protestants themselves were more. Is it not so as I tell you?

No indeed, it is not by your leave, good *Uncle.* For first the *Greek* Church as every body knows, pretends to perpetual succession of Doctrine, and undertakes to derive it from Christ and his Apostles, as confidently as we do ours: Neither is there any word in all this discourse, but might have been urged as fairly and as probably for the *Greek* Church as for the *Roman*: and therefore seeing your Arguments fight for both alike, they must either conclude for both, which is a direct impossibility, for then Contradictions should be both true: or else which is most certain they conclude for neither and are not Demonstrations as you pretend, (for never any Demonstration could prove both parts of a Contradiction) but meer Sophisms

phisms and Captions, as the progress of our answer shall justifie.

Secondly, It is so far from Protestants to grant the thing you speak of, To wit, that the controverted Doctrines of the *Roman* Church came from Apostolick Tradition, that they verily believe should the Apostles now live again, they would hardly be able to find amongst you the Doctrin which they taught by reason of abundance of trash and rubbish which you have laid upon it.

And lastly, They pretend not that Fathers and Councils may err and they cannot, nor that they were men and themselves are not; but that you do most unjustly and vainly to father your inventions of Yesterday upon the Fathers and Councils.

Nephew. I know that we Catholicks do reverence Traditions as much as Scripture it self: neither do I see why we should be blamed for it; for the words which Christ and his Apostles spake, must needs be as infallible as those which were written.

True. But still the question depends, whether Christ and his Apostles did indeed speak those words which you pretend they did: we say with *Irenæus: Præconiaverunt primum, scripserunt postea.* What they preacht first, that they wrote afterwards: we say with *Tertullian*——*(Ecclesias) Apostoli condiderunt, ipsi eis prædicando, tam vivâ quod aiunt voce, quam per Epistolas postea.*—The Apostles founded the Churches by their Preaching to them: first by word of mouth, then after by their writings. If you can prove the contrary do so and we yield: but hitherto you do nothing.

Nephew. And as for the keeping of it, I see the Scripture it self is beholden to Tradition (Gods providence presupposed) for the integrity both of the letter, and the sense. Of the letter it is confest: of the sense manifest. For the sense being a distinct thing from the naked letter, and rather fetcht out by force of consequence, than in expres and formal terms contained, (which is most true whether we speak of *Protestant* sense or the *Catholick)* it belongeth rather to Tradition than expres Text of Scripture.

That

That which you desire to conclude is, That we must be beholden to Tradition for the sense of Scripture: and your reason to conclude this is, because the sense is fetcht out by force of consequence: This of some places of Scripture is not true, especially those which belong to faith and good manners, which carry their meaning in their foreheads. Of others it is true, but nothing to the purpose in hand, but rather directly against it. For who will not say, If I collect the sense of Scripture by Reason, then I have it not from Authority: that is unless I am mistaken. If I fetch it out by force of Consequence, then I am not beholden to Tradition for it. But the letter of Scripture has been preserved by Tradition, and therefore why should we not receive other things upon Tradition as well as Scripture? I answer. The Jews Tradition preserved the books of the Old Testament, and why then doth our Saviour receive these upon their Tradition, and yet condemn other things which they suggested as matters of Tradition? If you say it was because these Traditions came not from *Moses* as they were pretended; I say also that yours are only pretended and not proved to come from the Apostles. Prove your Tradition of these Additions as well as you prove the Tradition of Scripture, and assure your selves, we then according to the injunction of the Council of *Trent* shall receive both with equal reverence.

Nephew. As it may appear by the sense of these few words. *Hoc est corpus meum,* whether you take the *Protestant* or the *Catholick* sense: For the same Text cannot have two contrary senses of it self, but as they are fetcht out by force of Argument; and therefore what sense hath best Tradition to shew for it self that's the Truth.

This is neither Protestant nor Catholick sense, but if we may speak the truth direct nonsense. For what if the same Text cannot have contrary senses: is there therefore no means but Tradition to determin which is the true sense? What connexion or what relation is there between this Antecedent and this Consequent? certainly they are

meer strangers to one another, and until they met by chance in this argument, never saw each other before. He that can find a third proposition to joyn them together in a good syllogism, I profess unto you, ——*Erit mihi magnus Appollo.* ——But what if of these two contrary senses the one, that is the Literal, draw after it a long train of absurdities; The other, that is the Figurative do not so? Have we not reason enough without advising with Tradition about the matter, to reject the Literal sense and embrace the Spiritual? S. *Austin* certainly thought we had: For he gives us this direction in his Book *de Doctrinâ Christianâ*; and the first and fittest Text that he could choose to exemplifie his Rule, what think you is it? even the Cousin-German to that which you have made choice of. *Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, &c.* Here saith he, the Letter seems to command impiety. *Figura est ergo.* Therefore it is a Figure commanding to feed devoutly, upon the Passion of our Lord, and to lay up in our memory that Christ was crucified for us.

Uncle. These particulars peradventure would require a further discussion, and now I will take nothing but what is undeniable. As this is, to wit, That what points are in Controversie betwixt us and Protestants, we believe to have been delivered by Christ and his Apostles to our forefathers, and by them delivered from hand to hand to our Fathers, whom we know to have delivered them for such to us, and to have received and believed them for such themselves.

Certainly though Ink and Paper cannot blush, yet I dare say you were fain to rub your forehead over and over before you committed this to Writing. Say what you list, for my part I am so far from believing you, that I verily believe you do not believe your selves, when you pretend that you believe those points of your Doctrin which are in controversie, to have been delivered to your Forefathers by Christ and his Apostles. Is it possible that any sober man who has read the New Testament, should believe that Christ and his Apostles taught Christians, That it was

was fit and lawful to deny the Laity the Sacramental Cup: That it was expedient and for the edification of the Church, that the Scripture should be read, and the publick worship of God perpetually celebrated in a language which they understand not, and to which for want of understanding, (unless S. *Paul* deceive us) they cannot say *Amen:* Or is it reasonable you should desire us to believe you, when your own Men, your own Champions, your own Councils confess the contrary?

Does not the Council of *Constance* acknowledg plainly, That the custom which they ratified, was contrary to Christs institution, and the custom of the Primitive Church? and how then was it taught by Christ and his Apostles?

Do not *Cajetan* and *Lyranus* confess ingenuously, that it follows evidently from S. *Paul,* that it is more for edification, that the Liturgy of the Church should be in such a Language as the Assistants understand?

The like Confession we have from others concerning Purgatory and Indulgences.

Others acknowledges the Apostles never taught Invocation of Saints.

Rhenanus says as much touching Auricular Confession.

It is evident from *Peter Lombard* that the Doctrin of Transubstantiation was not a point of Faith in his time.

From *Pius Mirandula* that the Infallibility of the Church was no Article, much less a foundation of Faith in his time.

Bellarmine acknowledges that the Saints enjoying the Vision of God before the day of judgment was no Article of Faith in the time of Pope *John* the XXII.

But as the Proverb is, when Thieves fall out, true men recover their goods: so how small and heartless the reverence of the Church of *Rome* is to ancient Tradition, cannot be more plainly discovered, than by the Quarrels which her Champions have amongst themselves, especially about the Immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin.

The Patrons of the Negative opinion, *Cajetan*, *Bannes*, *Bandellus* and *Canus*, alledg for it, First an whole army of Scriptures, Councils and Fathers, agreeing unanimously in this Doctrin, That only Christ was free from sin. Then, an innumerous multitude of Fathers expresly affirming the very point in question, not contradicted by any of their Contemporaries, or Predecessors, or indeed of their Successors for many ages.

All the Holy Fathers agree in this, that the Virgin *Mary* was conceived in Original sin. So * *Bannes.*

* In part primum q. 1. Art. 8. Dub. 5.

Cajetan brings for it fifteen Fathers in his judgment irrefragable, others produce two hundred, *Bandellus* almost three hundred. Thus † *Salmeron.*

† Disp. 51. in Ep. ad Rom.

That all the Holy Fathers who have fallen upon the mention of this matter, with one mouth affirm, that the Blessed Virgin was conceived in Original sin. So ‖ *Canus.*

‖ Lib. VII. loc. cap. 1. cap. 3. n. 9.

And after,——That the contrary Doctrin has neither Scripture nor Tradition for it. For (saith he) no Traditions can be derived unto us but by the Bishops and Holy Fathers, the Successors of the Apostles, and it is certain that those ancient writers received it not from their predecessors.

Now against this stream of ancient Writers, *when* the contrary new Doctrin came in, and how it prevailed, it will be worth the considering.

The First that set it abroach was *Richardus de Sancto Victore*, as his country-man * *Johannes Major* testifies of him. ——*He was expresly the first that held the* Virgin Mary *free from Original sin*, ——*or he was the first that expresly held so.* So after upon this false ground, which had already taken deep root in the heart of Christians, That it was impossible to give too much honour to her that was the Mother of the Saviour of the World; like an ill weed it grew and spread apace. So that in the Council of † *Basil*, (which *Binius* tells us was reprobated but in part, to wit, in the point of the Authority of Councils, and in the deposition of *Eugenius* the Pope) it was defined and declared, to be Holy Doctrin, and consonant to the worship of the Church,

* *Omnium expresse primus Christiferam virginem originalis noxæ expertem tenuit.* ——*De gestis Scotorum.* III. 12.

† Sess. XXXVI.

Church, to the Catholick Faith, to right Reason and the Holy Scripture, and to be approved, held and embraced by all Catholicks: and that it should be lawful for no man for the time to come to preach or teach the contrary. The custom also of keeping the Feast of her Holy Conception, which before was but particular to the *Roman* and some other Churches, and it seems somewhat neglected, was then renewed and made Universal; and commanded to be celebrated — *sub nomine Conceptionis* — *under the name of the Conception.* *Binius* in a Marginal note tells us indeed, That they celebrate not this Feast in the Church of *Rome*, by virtue of this Renovation, — *cum esset Conciliabulum* — being this was the act not of a Council, but of a Conventicle, yet he himself in his Index, stiles it the Oecomenical Council of *Basil*, and tells that it was reprobated only in two points, of which this is none. Now whom shall we believe, *Binius* in his Margin, or *Binius* in his Index?

Yet in after-times Pope *Sixtus* IV. and *Pius* V. thought not this Decree so binding, but that they might and did again put life into the condemned opinion, giving liberty by their constitutions to all men to hold and maintain either part, either that the Blessed Virgin was conceived with Original sin or was not. Which Constitution of *Sixtus* IV. The * Council of *Trent* renewed and confirmed. * Sess. V.

But the wheel again turning, and the Negative opinion prevailing, The Affirmative was banisht, first by a Decree of *Paul* V. from all publick Sermons, Lectures, Conclusions, and all publick Acts whatsoever: and since by another Decree of *Gregory* XV. from all private Writings, and private Conferences.

But yet all this contents not the University of *Paris.* They, as *Salmeron* tells us, admit none to the Degree of Doctor of Divinity, unless they have first bound themselves by solemn Oath to maintain the Immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin.

Now I beseech you Mr. *R*—— consider your courses with some indifference.

First,

First, You take Authority upon you, against the universal, constant, unopposed Tradition of the Church for many ages: to set up as a rival, a new upstart yesterdays invention: and to give all men liberty to hold which they please. So Pope *Sixtus* IV. The Council of *Trent*, and *Pius* V. that is, you make it lawful to hold the ancient Faith, or not to hold it, nay to hold the contrary. This is high presumption. But you stay not here; For,

Secondly, The ancient Doctrin you cloyster and hook up within the narrow, close and dark rooms of the thoughts and brains of the defenders of it, forbidding them upon pain of damnation so much as to whisper it in their private discourses and writings: and in the mean time the New Doctrin you set at full liberty, and give leave, nay countenance and encouragement to all men to employ their time and wits and tongues and pens, in the maintenance and propagation of it. Thus *Paul* V. and *Gregory* XV. Yet this is not all; For,

Thirdly, You bind men by Oaths to defend the new opinion, and to oppose the ancient. So the University of *Paris*. Yet still you proceed further; For,

Fourthly, By your General Councils confirmed by your Popes, you have declared and defined, that this new invention is agreeable, and consequently that the ancient Doctrin is repugnant to the Catholick Faith, to Reason, to the Holy Scripture. So the Council of *Basil*.

These things I entreat you weigh well in your Consideration, and put not into the Scale above a just allowance, not above three grains of partiality, and then tell me whether you can with reason or with modesty suppose or desire that we should believe, or think that you believe, that all the points of Doctrin which you contest against us, were delivered at first by Christ and his Apostles, and have ever since by the Succession of Bishops and Pastors been preserved inviolate and propagated unto you.

The Patrons I confess of this new Invention set not much by the Decree of the Council of *Basil* for it, but plead very hard for a full and final definition of it from the Sea Apostolick

Apostolick: and finding the conspiring opposition of the ancient Fathers to be the main impediment of their purpose, it is strange to see how confidently they ride over them.

First, Says * *Salmeron* in the place forecited, *they press us with multitude of Doctors; of whom we must not say that they err in a matter of such moment.* † Disp 51. in Epist. ad Rom.

We answer, says he, out of † *S.* Austin *and the Doctrin of S.* Thomas: *That the argument drawn from Authority is weak. Then to that multitude of Doctors we oppose another multitude.* ‖ De moribus Eccleſia. lib 1. cap. 2.

Thirdly, We object to the contrary the efficacy of reasons, which are more excellent than any Authority.

Some of them reckon two hundred Fathers, other as Bandellus *almost three hundred,* Cajetan *fifteen, but those as he says irrefragable. But as a wise Shepheard said* ——pauperis est numerare pecus. *Some of those whom they produce are of an exolete Authority, and scarce worthy of memory.*

Lastly, Against this objected multitude we answer with the word of God. * Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil. Neither shalt thou in judgment yield to the sentence of many to depart from the truth. *For when the* Donatists *gloried in the multitude of their Authors, S.* Austin *answered* it was a sign of a cause destitute of truth, to rely only upon the Authority of many men which may err. * Exod. 23. 2.

It falls out sometimes also that from some one Doctor, especially if he be famous, proceeds a multitude of followers of his Opinion, and some, taken with an humble and pious fear, choose rather to follow the Opinion of another against their mind, than to bring out of their own wit any thing new, lest they should so bring any new thing into the Church. Whose humility as it is to be praised, so the confidence of others is not to be condemned, who for the love of truth fear not to bring in better things. Thus S. Hierome *in his Sermon of the Assumption, if it be his, fears to affirm that the Virgin* Mary *is assumed into Heaven, and thinks it rather to be piously desired, than rashly defined. But * S.* Austin *more happily dared to affirm it, and settle it with many argument, by which adventure this the Church hath gained,* * In the Margint here he says, *The Doctrin of S.* Austin *alone hath brought into the Church the Worship of the blessed Virgins Assumption.*

gained, that perswaded by his reasons she hath believed it, and celebrates it in her worship.

But they fetch their arguments from the Antiquity of the Doctors, to which always greater honour was given than to Novelties. But I answer, old men are praisers of ancient times, but we affirm, the younger the Doctors are, the more perspicacious. Moreover we say that although they were ancient yet they were men, and themselves held under the darkness of Original sin and might err. But go to, who are these Ancients? are they Apostles? are they Ambrose *or* Hierom, *or* Austin? *but none of them discuss'd this Controversie on purpose.*

Chrysostom *is opposed in his Commentary on S.* Matthew, *where he saith* though Christ were not a sinner, yet he has humane Nature from a sinner. *Understand* (says *Salmeron*) *from her who of her self, and according to the condition of nature was a sinner.* Thomas *says that* Chrysostom *speaks exorbitantly, for he constitutes the* Virgin *under actual sin. Or that the Commentaries which go up and down under his name are not his. Or that these passages are adjectitious. Or if they be indeed his, with the good leave and favour of so great a man, they are to be rejected. Neither ought any man to marvel that he &* Bernard, *and* Thomas, *and* Bonaventure, *and* Alexander *of* Ales, *and* Albert, *and* Durand, *and* Egidius; *and Lastly, The greater part followed that opinion: both because they were men, and because in progress of time, new mysteries are revealed which before were unknown. — For as holiness of life purgeth no man from sin, so it frees no man from danger of error. — Every age finds out some verities proper to it self, which the former ages were ignorant of,* —and there in the Margin, *Every age hath its peculiar divine revelations.*

Thus far *Salmeron*, by whom we may see, That *Protestants* are not the only men who say that the Fathers may err: but that *Roman Catholicks* too, can and dare valiantly break through, and tread under their feet (though perhaps with cap in hand, and some shew of reverence) and even ride over whole bands of Fathers when they stand in their way.

Another

Another great *Achilles* for the same opinion is one *Joannes Baptista Poza*, a Jesuite, and Professor of Divinity at *Complutum*: He in his fourth Book of his *Elucidarium Deiparæ*, pleads very earnestly to have it defined, and labours very lustily to remove all exceptions to the contrary, but above all those many ones; —That there is no Tradition for it, That the stream of Ancient Tradition is against, and therefore well and worthily may it be condemned for an Heresie: but to be Canonized among the Articles of Faith, it can with no reason expect.

To the Second exception he brings two answers which *Salmeron* it seems forgot, in the prosecution whereof he hath many excellent passages, which I have thought good to cull out of him to evidence the wonderful reverence, and constant regard of the present Church of *Rome*, to the Tradition of the Ancient.

The first, That it is possible the Writings of the Fathers out of which these Testimonies against the *Immaculate conception* are taken, may be corrupted: But to shew it probable they are so in these places, he speaks not one word of sense, nor so much as any colourable reason, unless this may pass for one (as perhaps it may where reasons are scarce.) No proposition, which contradicts the common judgment of the Fathers can be probable, ; * But it is *de fide* that our opinion is probable, for the Council of *Trent* hath made it so by giving liberty to all to hold it. Therefore without doubt we must hold, that it is not (whatsoever it seems) against the common judgment of the Fathers. This argument saith he doth most illustriously convince the followers of the contrary opinion: that they ought not to dare affirm hereafter, that their opinion flowes from the common judgment and writings of the ancient Doctors.

* I should rather subsume, but this does so. Therefore not probable.

His second answer is, That whereas *Bandillus* and *Cajetan*, &c. produce general sayings of *Irenæus*, *Origen*, *Athanasius*, *Theophilus Alexandrinus*, *Greg. Nyssen*, *Basil*, *Greg. Naz.* *Cyprian*, *Hierom*, *Fulgentius*, and in a manner of all the ancient Fathers, exempting Christ alone from, and consequently concluding the Virgin *Mary* under Original

sin, which Argument must needs conclude if the Virgin *Mary* be not Christ. His answer I say is, These Testimonies have little or no strength: for did they conclude, we must then (let us in Gods name) say that the Virgin *Mary* committed also many venial sins: For the Scriptures, Fathers and Councils set forth in propositions as Universal. That there is no man but Christ who is not often defiled at least with smaller sins, and who may not justly say that Petition of our Lords Prayer, *Dimitte nobis debita nostra.*

An answer I confess as fit as a Napkin to stop the mouths of his domestick adversaries, though no way fit to satisfie their reason. But this man little thought there were *Protestants* in the world as well as *Dominicans*, who will not much be troubled by thieves falling out, to recover more of their goods than they expected, and to see a prevaricating Jesuit, instead of stopping one breach in their ruinous cause, to make two. For whereas this man argues from the destruction of the Consequent to the destruction of the Antecedent thus: If these testimonies were good and concluding, then the Virgin *Mary* should have been guilty not only of Original but also of actual sin, But the Consequent is false and blasphemous: Therefore the Antecedent is not true. They on the others side argue, and sure with much more reason, and much more conformity to the Ancient Tradition: From the Assertion of the Antecedent to the Assertion of the Consequent, thus: If these testimonies be good and concluding, then the Blessed Virgin was guilty both of Original sin and Actual; but the Testimonies are good and concluding; therefore she was guilty even of actual sins, and therefore much more of Original.

His Third Answer is, That their Church hath, or may define many other things against which (if their works be not depraved) there lies a greater consent of Fathers, than against the Immaculate Conception, and therefore why not this?

The Instances he gives are four.

1. That the Blessed Virgin committed no actual sin.

2. That

2. That the Angels were not created before the visible world.

3. That Angels are Incorporeal.

4. That the Souls of Saints departed are made happy by the Vision of God before the day of Judgment.

Against the first Opinion he alledges direct places out of *Origen*, which he says admit no exposition; though *Pamelius* upon *Tertullian*, and *Sixtus Senensis* labour in vain to put a good sense on them. — Out of *Euthymias* and *Theophylact*: Out of S. *Chrysostom* divers pregnant testimonies, and S. *Thomas* his confession touching one of them, out of the Author of the Questions of the New and Old Testament in S. *Austin* cap. 75. Out of S. *Hilary* upon *Psa.* 118. which words yet says he *Tolet* has drawn to a good construction: yet so much difficulty still remains in them. — Out of *Tertullian de carne Christi* cap. 7. which he tells us will not be salved by *Pamelius* his gloss. — Out of *Athanasius*, out of *Irenæus* III. 18. out of S. *Austin* lib. 2. *de Symbolo ad Catech.* cap. 5. Whose words yet, because they admit, says *Poza*, some exposition, I thought fit to suppress, though some think they are very hard to be avoided. Out of *Greg. Nyss.* — out of S. *Cyprian* in his Sermon on the Passion: Whose words, says he; though they may by some means be eluded, yet will always be very difficult if we examin the Antecedents and Consequents: out of *Anselm*, *Rich. de* S. *Victor*, S. *Ambrose*, S. *Andrew* of *Hierusalem*, and S. *Bede* and then tells us there are many other Testimonies much resembling these: and besides many Fathers and Texts of Scripture, which exempt Christ only from actual sin, and lastly, many suspicious sayings against her Immunity in them, who use to say that at the Angels Annunciation she was cleansed and purged and expiated from all faults committed by her freewill, which saith he, though *Canisius* and others explicate in a pious sense, yet at least they shew, that either those alledged against the Imaculate conception are as favourable to be expounded: Or we must say, that a verity may be defined by the See Apostolick against the judgment of some Fathers.

From these things, says he, is drawn an unanswerable reason, That for the defining the purity of the conception, nothing now is wanting. For seeing, notwithstanding more and more convincing testimonies of Fathers who either did, or did seem to ascribe actual sin to the Blessed Virgin; notwithstanding the Universal sayings of Scripture and Councils bringing all, except Christ, under sin: Lastly, notwithstanding the silence of the Scriptures and Councils touching her Immunity from actual sin, seeing notwithstanding all this the Council of *Trent* hath either decreed, or hath confirmed, it being before decreed by the consent of the faithful, that the Blessed Virgin never was guilty of any voluntary, no not the least sin: It follows certainly that the Apostolick See, hath as good nay better ground, to enrol amongst her Articles the Virgins Immaculate conception: The reason is clear, for neither are there so many nor so evident sentences of Fathers which impute any fault or blemish to the Conception of the Mother of God, as there are in appearance to charge her with actual offences. Neither are there fewer Universal propositions in Scripture, by which it may be proved that only Jesus was free from actual sin, and therefore that the Virgin *Mary* fell into it. Neither can there at this time be desired a greater consent of the faithful, nor a more ardent desire than there now is, that this verity should be defined, and that the contrary Opinion should be Anathematized for Erroneous and Heretical. The words of the Council of *Trent* on which this reason is grounded are these.

Sess. VI. c. 23. de Justifical.

If any man say, That a man all his life long may avoid all, even venial sins, unless by special priviledge from God, as the Church holds of the Blessed Virgin, let him be Anathema. But if the consent of the Church hath prevailed against more clear Testimonies of ancient Fathers, even for that which is favoured with no express authority of Scriptures or Councils: And if the Council of *Trent* upon this consent of the faithful, hath either defined this Immunity of the Virgin, from all actual sin, or declared it to be defined: Who then

can

can deny but that the Church hath Immediate power to define among the Articles of Faith, the pious Opinion of the Immaculate Conception?

His second Example by which he declares the power of their Church to define Articles against a multitude of Fathers (and consequently not only without but against Tradition) is the opinion that Angels were not created before the Corporeal world was created: which saith he is, or may be defined, though there were more Testimonies of Fathers against it, than against the Immaculate Conception. So he says in the Argument of his Fifth Chapter, and in the end of the same Chapter: The Council of *Lateran* hath defined this against the expres judgment of twenty Fathers, of which *Nazianzen*, *Basil*, *Chrysostome*, *Cyrill*, *Hierom*, *Ambrose*, and *Hillary* are part.

His third Example to the same purpose, is the opinion that Angels are Incorporeal: against which saith he, in the Argument of his sixth Chapter: there are more Testimonies of the Fathers, than against the Immaculate Conception, and yet it is, or at least may be defined by the Church, and in the end of the Chapter, I have for this Opinion cited twenty three Fathers, which as most men think is now condemned in the * *Lateran* Council, or at least as † *Suarez* proves, is to be rejected as manifestly temerarious.

*Firm de summâ Trinitate.
† De Angelis. lib. 6.

His fourth and last Example to the same purpose is, The Opinion that the Souls of Saints departed enjoy the Vision of God before the Resurrection. Against which he tells us in the first place was the Judgment of Pope *John* XXI. though not as a Pope but as a private Doctor. Then he musters up against it a great multitude of *Greek* and *Latin* Fathers, touching which he says—— All these Testimonies when * *Vasquez* has related, at length he † answers that they might be so explained as to say nothing against the true and Catholick Doctrin. Yet if they could not be so explained, their Authority ought not to hinder us from embracing that which the Church

* 1. 2. D. 29. cap. 1.
† cap. 3.

Church hath defined. The same argument I make (says *Poza*) The Fathers and ancient Doctors which are objected against the pious opinion of the Conception of the Virgin, may be commodiously explicated, or at least so handled that they shall not hurt: Notwithstanding though they cannot be explicated, some of them, that their Testimonies ought not to hinder, but that the Sea Apostolick may define the Blessed Virgins preservation from Original sin. In fine, for the close of this Argument he adds, *Nolo per plura.* ——I will not run through more Examples: These that I have reckoned are sufficient, and admonishes learned men to bring together other like proofs, whereby they may promote the desired Determination.

FINIS.